



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2019

No. 129

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who provides us with strength for life's journey, today, empower our Senators with an extraordinary measure of grace to accomplish Your purposes. As they work under the duress of time and pressures from diverse interests, inspire them to strive to live with integrity, making ethical decisions that honor You.

Lord, be with their staff members who run the offices and provide the data needed for responsible decisions. Be also with those who process the mountains of business in and out of cloakrooms. Lord, sustain those who transcribe the debates for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Bless those who monitor parliamentary order, schedules, and voting records. Protect those who provide security at the doors, on the floors, and on the streets. And, Lord, bless our pages. Strengthen all who are a part of the Senate's support system, surrounding them with Your protection and favor.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute in morning business.

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

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to take our Nation and my colleagues back to the Revolutionary War.

More than 240 years ago, sailors aboard the warship *Warren* disclosed significant misconduct by the commander of the Continental Navy. The Congress then recognized these brave whistleblowers' valuable contribution to our brandnew Republic because, on this day—today—in 1778, Congress passed this resolution, saying: "It is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States . . . to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds, or misdemeanors committed by any offices or persons in the service of these states."

That is the beginning of the government recognizing whistleblowers as valuable patriots.

Following in their footsteps, this Senate has also unanimously agreed to designate today as National Whistleblower Appreciation Day.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate has a lot of important business to attend to before we adjourn for the August State work period.

As a reminder to all of our colleagues, here is our considerable to-do list for this week: Later this morning, we will vote to confirm two more of President Trump's impressive nominees for district courts: Michael Liburdi for the District of Arizona and Peter Welte for the District of North Dakota.

They are just the first two in a significant group of judges—19 in all—that the Senate needs to process before we wrap up the week. We can't head home without making another big dent in the backlog of qualified district judge nominees whom partisan obstruction has already kept waiting entirely too long.

In addition, the Senate is not going anywhere until we confirm two impressive nominees to executive branch positions that play a vital role in U.S. foreign policy and national security. Ambassador Kelly Craft is President Trump's excellent choice to serve as our Ambassador to the United Nations. David Norquist is his pick for Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Needless to say, these are troubling times in a troubled world. We need to get both of these highly capable public servants on the job this week.

Finally, we must also pass the bipartisan government funding agreement that President Trump's negotiating team worked out with Speaker PELOSI. Given the realities of divided government, it is a strong deal that achieves my Republican colleagues' and my No. 1 priority: continuing to invest seriously in rebuilding the readiness of our Armed Forces and modernizing them to meet the challenges of today.

The Trump administration has negotiated their way to a major win on defense. The House has passed the compromise legislation. The President is ready and waiting to sign it.

Once the Senate passes it later this week, he can sign it into law, taking funding crises and long-term continuing resolutions off the table, and pave Congress's path toward a regular appropriations process that will provide the resources our military commanders and our servicemembers need to keep us safe.

I urge all of my colleagues to join President Trump in support of this legislation when we vote on it later this week.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5151

TRIBUTE TO KATHRYN WEEDEN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, as Senate majority leader, it is my honor this morning to acknowledge a truly remarkable legacy of service to the Senate and really to the Nation.

Next month, the Senate Page School will say goodbye to its beloved principal. After 26 years heading up this unique institution, our very own Mrs. Kathryn Weeden is starting a new chapter as a very deserving retiree.

For more than a quarter century, Principal Weeden has been a constant anchor in a place where rotation and change are par for the course.

The Page School, as we know, welcomes a new class of high-achieving young people from all across the country every semester. These students' experience is most famous for the fast-paced, hands-on exposure to the inner workings of American government it involves, but in the early mornings and late evenings, when they are not delivering bill text around the Capitol, assisting Members on the floor, or engaged in any number of tasks that help this place actually run, they are also dealing with the academic rigors of the 11th grade.

There are 30 teenagers at a time living, studying, and working full time on Capitol Hill. Needless to say, keeping this unique arrangement running smoothly is less than an ordinary job—even a full-time one—and more like a life's mission. By all accounts, it is a mission Principal Weeden has executed with constant competence, total professionalism, and the utmost grace.

Now, if I had to guess, a large share of that grace was spent in 5 a.m. meetings most mornings. That is typically when she would first encounter what I am sure were the most chipper and alert 16- and 17-year-olds around. While the hundreds of pages who have worked, studied, and grown under Principal Weeden's watch may not miss their early morning math class, they sure will miss her. They are left with lasting memories of her attentive mentorship and compassion.

Among recent graduates of the Page Program, some of whom I have been proud to sponsor through my own office, the conclusion is clear: Principal Weeden is simply the best.

They remember the way she would make time for weekly one-on-one meetings to check up on their progress and talk about their future goals. They remember the way she radiated excitement leading the school in assembling care packages for servicemembers deployed overseas. They remember her knack for reassuring words and for helping them put the daily stresses of high school in perspective.

Inevitably, after 26 years, Principal Weeden's legacy is counted in the flood of letters sharing stories like these following the news of her retirement, but it is also measured in her commitment to transform the Page School as a top-notch academic institution.

It is thanks to her no-nonsense leadership that this unique program has earned and maintained accreditation, that its rigors have earned the attention and respect of prestigious universities, and that it continues to attract talented and passionate educators to carry on in her example.

Unsurprisingly, the colleagues and faculty whom Ms. Weeden has mentored and supervised are no less enthusiastic in their praise than her former students. Talking to them about their departing boss, you hear words like disciplined, nurturing, and patriotic. You are painted a picture that looks something like a Mother Superior, a no-nonsense administrator, an exacting leader, and a true friend all in one.

Being entrusted with the care, feeding, education, and maturation of so many young men and women over so many years would be an accomplishment no matter where Principal Weeden had worked, but to do all that at the Senate Page School means something even more. To a special degree, her legacy will have helped, formed, and shaped America's civic future for the better.

Because she gave of herself so generously to a special class of young people—those who are so interested in our American Government that they just had to come see it firsthand—today, the Senate celebrates this outstanding legacy and warmly congratulates Principal Weeden on such a tremendous accomplishment. We thank her for all she has done, and we wish her nothing but happiness in the years that lie ahead.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate has just a few more days this week to pass legislation to lift the budget caps and extend the debt ceiling before the summer State work period. As the minority leader, I don't have control over the schedule here on the floor, much to my dismay. So I am left to ask my friend, the majority leader, who does control the floor schedule: Why don't we vote on the caps deal today?

Four congressional leaders and the White House reached an agreement 2 weeks ago. The President supports it. The House has already passed it. Secretary Mnuchin has said we need this

legislation urgently before the State work period because he can't guarantee that we will not hit the debt ceiling before Congress reconvenes. The majority leader spoke about the importance of moving the budget agreement back in mid-May. Now the clock is ticking.

I make clear to the leader and to all of my friends on the other side of the aisle, as well as all Americans: Democrats are ready to vote on the House bill today so it can get to the President's desk and we can avoid even a glimmer of default.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another matter, last week former Special Counsel Mueller testified that Russian interference in our democracy "wasn't a single attempt. They're doing it as we sit here and they expect to do it in the next campaign."

The Russians, he said, interfered in the last election and are trying to interfere again. Mueller said: "Much more needs to be done in order to protect against these intrusions, not just by the Russians but by others as well."

It was not just Mueller who said these things or agreed with these ideas and sentiments. FBI Director Wray, appointed by President Trump, has shared similar sentiments. Departing DNI Director Coats—lifelong Republican, former member of this body, well respected by all, and appointed by President Trump—has repeatedly warned about the threat posed by Russia. The Senate Intelligence Committee, chaired by a Republican, Senator BARR, did the same.

It is with these facts as the backdrop—the testimony of prominent Republicans, allies of President Trump and friends and allies of our colleagues here—that Democrats have been pushing for election security—so far, to little avail. Leader MCCONNELL and the Republican majority have not allowed a single election security bill to reach the floor of the Senate. We haven't had a single bill open for amendment all year.

So, last week, understandably frustrated at the lack of progress, Democrats asked unanimous consent to pass House legislation to safeguard our elections. Leader MCCONNELL blocked that request saying yesterday: "I am not going to let Democrats and their water-carriers in the media use Russia's attack on our democracy as a Trojan horse for partisan wish list items."

"Partisan wish list items"—really? What are these items on our partisan wish list, you might ask? Using paper ballots—that is partisan? Using paper ballots is widely agreed upon as a reform to protect our elections from manipulation. Does Leader MCCONNELL object to paper ballots? Does Leader MCCONNELL believe paper ballots are partisan? They are part of our elections, whoever wins.

How about this one: We want the postelection audits to make sure the

Russians or any other foreign power didn't interfere. Does Leader MCCONNELL object to auditing our elections to make sure the outcomes are accurate? Are election audits partisan?

Making sure the States and localities have adequate resources to update and maintain election infrastructure—does Leader MCCONNELL oppose that, when 21 attorneys general have said they don't have enough money now to guard their election processes and machines from manipulation by Russia or others?

So that is "our partisan wish list"—paper ballots, election audits, and money to protect us from the Russians. If Leader MCCONNELL opposes these policies, fine, but let him say so. I repeat, protecting our election from Russian interference is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue or an Independent issue, and it is not a liberal issue or a conservative issue. It is not a moderate issue. It is an issue that goes to the wellspring of our democracy and something the Founding Fathers warned about—foreign interference. James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Benjamin Franklin all were worried about foreign interference in our elections, and now Leader MCCONNELL calls it partisan to worry about it? Please.

If Leader MCCONNELL wants to debate other legislation than what we propose and what has passed the House—legislation like the FIRE Act or the Duty to Report Act or the Prevention of Foreign Interference with Elections Act—bring it on. Let's do it. If Leader MCCONNELL wants to address election security in the appropriations process, we would welcome his support on an amendment to send more funding to the States. We want to get something done on election security because this is not about party. This is a matter of national security. This is about the sanctity of elections, something for which Americans have died for generations. It is not partisan at all. It is the wellspring of our democracy.

But so long as the Senate Republicans prevent legislation from reaching the floor, so long as they oppose additional appropriations to the States, so long as they malign election security provisions as "partisan wish lists," the critics are right to say that Leader MCCONNELL and Republican Senators are blocking election security because, at the moment, that is true.

VENEZUELA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on one last subject, after I conclude my remarks, I will yield to my friend, colleague, and former roommate from Illinois, who will ask this body to take up and pass what I believe is a very important measure, temporary protected status for Venezuelans currently residing in the United States.

Last week, the House passed bipartisan legislation that would grant these protections—a lifeline to families

who are facing a forced return to unstable and dangerous situations in their country.

Few nations, outside wartime, have endured the economic, humanitarian, and political devastation that Venezuela endures today. Hospitals and pharmacies lack basic medicines. The rate of violent crime has risen sharply, and 300,000 children are at risk of dying from malnutrition. Venezuela clearly meets the standard for temporary protected status. The situation is too dire and too dangerous for Venezuelan nationals to return to the country.

So I am glad the House has taken action to pass these temporary protections on a bipartisan basis, and the Senate should follow suit. The President could have acted on his own to help Venezuelans living in America, but he has repeatedly denied congressional requests to extend TPS relief for them during this critical time of transition from the despotic regime of Nicolas Maduro. President Trump's inaction has compelled Congress to act.

So I salute my friend, Senator DURBIN, as well as Senator MENENDEZ, our two leaders on this issue, as they ask the Senate to take up the House-passed TPS bill. I hope, earnestly, that our friends on the other side will let it go through.

I suggest the absence of a quorum for a moment so I might confer with the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael T. Liburdi, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

VENEZUELA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank the leader, Senator SCHUMER from New York, for his introduction of the remarks I am about to make. But before I do, let me preface it by saying that I couldn't agree with him more. When you take a look at this empty Senate Chamber and realize we are in session this week with the possibility of bringing important legislation to the floor, you have to ask the obvious question: Where is everybody? Why aren't we acting like a Senate? Why are we meeting and having speeches instead of debate on important legislation? What could be more important than the security of an election?

We have a lot of young people across America. We say to them: Register to vote. Your vote makes a difference. You get to choose the leaders for this country's future. Be sure and vote.

But we have to be honest with you. Your vote is under attack—first, by apathy—people don't register and they don't vote—and second, by outside foreign influence and forces.

We know what happened 4 years ago in the Presidential election. The Russians tried to invade the U.S. electoral process and change it. I know it firsthand because it happened first in the State of Illinois. Turns out someone put together a computer program that had a little opening in it, a little hole, and that is all they needed. Sitting in Moscow, these folks in front of computers were searching day in and day out for ways to get into the voters' list in Illinois, and they were successful. They were successful in invading the voting list, the official records of our State on the people who were eligible to vote. They could have done some mischievous things. They could have disrupted our election. Thank goodness they didn't, but it would have been as simple as going through and just changing the addresses, one digit in the address of every registered voter, so when that voter came to vote, the ID card or information given to the judge at the election place wouldn't match up in terms of their address with the official record. That meant they would have voted with a provisional ballot, and those ballots would have stacked up with the thousands of people who could have been victimized by the Russians in my State of Illinois.

We said very publicly—we were the first State to say publicly: The Russians have done this to us.

We didn't see any changes in the voter file. We knew they had the capacity and ability to do it, but they didn't. We have known ever since that they have been attacking our electoral process.

Why didn't we hear about it as much in the most recent election in 2018? Well, specifically because we were in the circumstance where we were fighting it. Our intelligence agencies were fighting it.

So this is a valid issue, an important issue, and it is one that I hope Leader

SCHUMER made clear to those listening to this debate. Why won't Senator MITCH MCCONNELL bring to the floor of the U.S. Senate election security legislation—bipartisan legislation—that will, in the course of passing it, make us safer when it comes to our electoral process? What is this kind of bromance between the President and Vladimir Putin? I don't understand.

But now there appears to be another party on the scene. Senator MCCONNELL is joining in this effort: Keep our hands off of Russia. Don't confront Russia. I don't understand why the Senator from Kentucky is taking that position. He should be pushing forward on a bipartisan basis to protect our election security.

Madam President, now I see my friend and Republican colleague from Utah is here, and I know the purpose of his attendance. I am about to make a statement about TPS status for Venezuelans in the United States. I will preface it briefly, make my request, and allow the Senator from Utah, if he doesn't want to stay here, to respond, and I will continue.

Last year, I went to Venezuela. It was my first time. I met with President Nicolas Maduro, and I said to him: If you have the election you plan to have, it will not be credible, and around the world, you will find the United States and many other nations will reject the outcome. You have to open up the process. Stop putting your political opponents in jail. Have a real election, a free election. Venezuela needs it, not just from a constitutional viewpoint, but your economy is in shambles, and if you want the world to join you in rebuilding the Venezuelan economy, you have to be the credible leader and you can't be if you go through with this election as planned.

That was my speech. It didn't work. He had the election as he planned it. He made sure that his opponents were under house arrest or in jail. He fixed the vote and ended up declaring himself the winner, and no one accepted it. So across the world, you find this resistance to his leadership.

There are some 70,000 people from Venezuela in the United States. They are here on visitor visas, work visas, student visas, and similar capacities. They are now being asked to return to Venezuela. But listen to the circumstances: In Venezuela—we know that it is not safe for Americans to visit. Senator MENENDEZ has spoken on this issue. He is joining me in this effort today. We are warning Americans that it is unsafe to visit Venezuela, but we are telling the Venezuelans who are in the United States that they have to go back.

What we are asking for is temporary protected status for these Venezuelans to be able to stay in the United States during the pendency of this contest that is going on about the future of that nation.

People are literally starving to death in Venezuela. They have no medicine.

It is in the worst possible situation. How can we in good conscience say to these Venezuelans who are in the United States that they have to return?

So the purpose of my effort today on the floor is to say that we should discharge from the Judiciary Committee legislation that allows these Venezuelans to stay here while we have declared it so dangerous in their home country. It is a rational and thoughtful thing to do, although, sadly, the Trump administration has sent me a letter saying they don't approve of it.

It is time for Congress to act. It is time for the Senate to act. I am going to make my formal motion at this point because Senator LEE has come to the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 549

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 549 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I reserve the right to object after raising a couple of observations.

It is important to know that this bill was passed by the House of Representatives Thursday night. We just received the paperwork from the House of Representatives yesterday. This is a bill that did not pass unanimously in the House of Representatives—far from it. There were at least 158 Republicans who voted against it.

There are a number of my colleagues in the Senate who, like me, would like to see this and many other bills considered but would also like the opportunity to adequately review the legislation as passed and to propose amendments and have those amendments voted on. So passing this bill right now without that opportunity to review it, to propose amendments and have those considered, and just passing this unanimously is not the way we ought to be passing this legislation.

I am happy to work with my distinguished colleague and my revered friend from Illinois in moving in that direction, but we are not ready to pass this by unanimous consent right now. We have amendments to propose. So on that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague from Utah. I am sorry he objected to my request.

Why are we moving so quickly on this? Because it is a matter of life and death, that is why. Why did we decide that this is of such an emergency nature that the House has moved on this already? Because, literally, people who

are forced to return to Venezuela may face death. That is why we are moving on this as quickly as we are.

I want to thank the House of Representatives for passing this measure. It is time for the Senate to act, and we certainly have the time on the floor to achieve that.

As I mentioned, if you go to Venezuela, as I did last year, you can see literally on the streets the impact of this disintegration of their economy and the problems they are facing.

I visited Children's Hospital in Caracas, and it was heartbreaking for the medical staff to sit down at the table and tell me they didn't have the basic medicines we find in our medicine chests at home or in the clinics of America when it came to treating these children. They did not have antibiotics. They didn't have cancer drugs.

The economy in Venezuela is disintegrating before our eyes, and these people—Venezuelans in the United States, students and others—are saying they would like to remain in the United States and stay here until it is more stable in their country. Historically, there were no questions asked, and we did that. We have done it over and over again. But under this administration, whenever the word "immigrant" comes into the conversation, they freeze.

The same Trump administration has told us that the Maduro regime is unacceptable and that we have to get rid of it because of the terrible things that are happening, that the people of Venezuela should have a free election to decide their leader. This same administration will not help the Venezuelans who say they are fearful of heading home to a country that is so dangerous.

Let me read what this administration, which refuses to give temporary protected status, says to people from the United States who may want to visit Venezuela. To me, it tells the whole story. Here is what the Trump State Department says about Venezuela today in the following travel advisory to American citizens:

Do not travel to Venezuela due to crime, civil unrest, poor health infrastructure, and arbitrary arrest and detention of U.S. citizens. . . . Violent crime, such as homicide, armed robbery, kidnapping, and carjacking, is common. . . . There are shortages of food, electricity, water, medicine, and medical supplies throughout much of Venezuela.

Those are the words of the Trump administration about this country of Venezuela, and when I ask that those who are Venezuelan who are in our country not be forced to return to those conditions, there is an objection not only from my friend the Republican Senator from Utah but also from the Trump administration.

Now, make no mistake, if temporary protected status is granted, that does not mean we won't ask any questions of the Venezuelans here. They will have to go through a criminal background check. If they are a dangerous person, they are gone, period. No questions. They are gone. And that is the

way it should be. But for those, for example, in my State who are university students, who have their student visas coming to an end—they are asking me: Senator DURBIN, will you allow me to stay in the United States until it is safe in my country?

Is that an unreasonable request? If it were Americans in similar plights in places around the world, wouldn't we say: Give them a break. Give them a chance to stay in a safe place.

I will close. I want to defer to my friend from New Jersey, Senator MENENDEZ, on this issue.

When I went to Venezuela last year, in Caracas, I had a meeting. It was a dinner meeting, and it was an unusual one because it was with six members of the General Assembly who are opponents of President Maduro, who is currently their leader in that country. These opposition leaders opposed him, and their lives were at stake because of it.

We had dinner in a restaurant. It was an unusual dinner. It was upstairs in a back room, and the door was closed so that no one could see us. There were six of them, and they said to me: If you come back next year, Senator, two of us will have been deported, two of us will be in prison; and two of us will have disappeared.

That is what happens to the opposition in Venezuela if you happen to oppose President Maduro. It is that dangerous.

One of those six was a man named Juan Guaido. I met him that night for the first time. Little did I know that he would step up several months ago and put his life and his family's lives on the line to say: I think Venezuela needs new leadership. Exceptional courage on his part. I met him then. I have met his wife since. They are literally risking their lives for their country. They understand how dangerous it is.

All I asked for today on the floor is for those Venezuelans who wish to stay here in safety until this political scenario plays out, that they be allowed to stay here. That is all I was asking for—temporary protected status. I am sorry that Senator LEE objected. He did note, though, that in some period of time—I hope very soon—he will reconsider that position and give us a chance to provide safety for the Venezuelans who are visiting here in the United States.

Because he is here and has been such a great ally of mine in this effort, I would like to yield the floor to my friend from New Jersey, Senator MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, let me thank my colleague from Illinois, who has been a clarion voice in this regard, a strong proponent of human rights and democracy in Venezuela and in other parts of the world, but in this case, in Venezuela; who has traveled there at a time when people

could not travel—certainly from the Congress—in an effort to see if there was a pathway forward and to see the plight of the Venezuelan people. I really appreciate his cosponsorship with me on this temporary protected status for Venezuelans. His leadership is critically important, not only as the Democratic whip but also as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee that I hope can take up this legislation.

I will say this: I regret that our colleague from Utah, No. 1, objected, and No. 2, left. I would just make two observations on his comments. No. 1, there was a strong bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives. So, no, there was not unanimity, but there was a strong bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives. Secondly, this legislation has been over here in the Senate for some time. We have offered it for some time, so it is not new.

Thirdly, I would just say as to whether we get to legislate in this Chamber, that depends on the majority leader and his side of the aisle, who control the floor. We would like to see legislating take place. We would be happy to have a debate on the fierce urgency of this as it relates to this issue of TPS, temporary protected status.

I fear my colleague was unaware of what he objected to. This is urgently needed legislation that would have granted that temporary—underline temporary—protected status. This is a class of people who need to be protected, the approximately 200,000 Venezuelans currently residing in the United States.

As we all know, the Maduro regime has created an unprecedented humanitarian crisis in Venezuela that has now forced more than 4 million Venezuelans and migrants to flee their homeland—more than 4 million. Think about it. This is on the verge of becoming one of the greatest humanitarian catastrophes in a refugee situation that we have in the world—and that is something considering what has happened in Syria and other places in the world—right here in our own hemisphere.

In response to this humanitarian tragedy, last December—this has been around several months—Senator DURBIN offered the first bipartisan bill to provide TPS for Venezuelans, which we reintroduced in February. Last week, the House passed their own bipartisan version of the legislation with support of dozens of Republican Members. It is an unconscionable moral failing for the Senate not to approve this legislation.

Earlier this month, as the senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I traveled to the Venezuela border to see the crisis firsthand. I returned convinced that we cannot afford to sit on the sidelines any longer. My colleague, I think, would not have objected to TPS for Venezuelans if he saw what I saw.

During my trip to Cucuta, I walked on the Colombian side of the Simon Bolivar International Bridge, between Colombia and Venezuela, amidst thou-

sands of Venezuelan refugees—30,000 cross each and every day—and migrants who cross into Colombia each and every day. I joined thousands of Venezuelans who were fleeing hunger as they sought food at the Divine Providence soup kitchen.

I visited patients seeking medical care that is no longer available in Venezuela. By the way, Venezuela should be one of the wealthiest countries in the Western Hemisphere. It has huge oil and natural gas reserves, but despite that they can't get medical care in Venezuela because the hospital system has completely collapsed. When I was there in Colombia at the border, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights issued a report decrying that the Maduro regime's security forces had murdered nearly 7,000 Venezuelans in the last 2 years—7,000. My colleague cannot possibly want to return Venezuelans to the cruel conditions they are fleeing. That is what temporary protected status is all about.

I have applauded—I don't find too many times in which I am in agreement with the Trump administration, but I supported their efforts on sanctions and other efforts around the Maduro regime so we can restore democracy and human rights, but how can you say and do all the things you are doing in Venezuela and then have a deportation force that wants to round up these people who have done nothing wrong and send them back to the country where 7,000 have been killed by Maduro?

These extraordinary conditions have scattered millions of Venezuelans in countries across the Americas. Today 1.3 million reside in Colombia, 750,000 in Peru, 250,000 in Ecuador, and the numbers keep growing. Colombia and its neighbors have largely welcomed Venezuelans as they flee a devastating humanitarian catastrophe.

By not approving this bill today, the United States is failing to match their efforts and failing to approve temporary protected status for the vulnerable of Venezuelans already living in our country.

For those who doubt whether TPS would make a difference for these Venezuelan families, let me share with you a few stories provided to my office by the respected Venezuelan human rights group Foro Penal.

Yuley Gomez is the mother of Luis David, a 4-year-old who has a delicate heart condition. In Venezuela, Yuley asked for help from everyone she could, but all she received was a prescription for painkillers. In a closed-door meeting, she was told privately to wait for the inevitable death of her child, a 4-year-old. Just imagine being told to wait for a son or daughter to succumb to a treatable illness. No parent would do that.

After great personal sacrifice, Yuley made it to the United States and admitted her son into Boston Children's Hospital. Three years later, David is

thriving, but he requires frequent checkups and treatments that remain unavailable in Venezuela to this day.

Then there is Leila Calderon, who resides in my home State of New Jersey. Her nephew, who once lived with her in Caracas, is a pilot in the Venezuela Armed Forces. He was wrongly arrested for plotting to overthrow Maduro. In the absence of evidence, he was released from jail, but on his way home, he received a call warning him that military counterintelligence agents were waiting for him. When he tried to hide, security forces arbitrarily arrested his mother, his girlfriend, and his father-in-law. The following day, he was detained and charged once more, again with no evidence. He remains imprisoned today.

Even Leila, who has publicly advocated for his release, has been labeled as a “terrorist” on national television by the regime thug Diosdado Cabello.

Let me share the story of Omar Acosta. His brother, Captain Rafael Acosta Arevalo, was detained on June 21, 2019, by members of the Venezuela military counterintelligence. After being forcibly imprisoned for a week, on June 28 of 2019, Captain Acosta was rolled into an arraignment hearing in a wheelchair, visibly affected by torture. He died the following day. The kind of torture that took Captain Acosta's life is one of the many dangers Venezuelans in the United States would need to fear if we don't approve TPS.

The Maduro regime's unthinkable abuses have created a full-blown refugee crisis in our own hemisphere. These extraordinary, and what we pray are temporary, conditions prevent millions of Venezuelans from safely returning home, including nearly 200,000 in our own country.

There has been a broad bipartisan support for the Trump administration's effort to confront the Maduro regime. However, as we confront Maduro, we cannot turn our back on the Venezuelan people. Unfortunately, today the Senate has chosen not to act. We could have sent legislation to the President's desk that ensures that vulnerable Venezuelans in the United States are not sent back into harm's way—into potential death or imprisonment. Instead, we did nothing.

This is a tragedy in its own right. This is what we could have avoided today. I am sure Senator DURBIN and I will continue to push forward. We will both challenge the leadership here to allow us either to have this passed or give us a vote. I think the community should know who stands on their side and whether they are willing to protect them temporarily from the enormous humanitarian catastrophe—the great risk of the loss of life or liberty that exists for Venezuelans in the United States who have fled to freedom.

We are going to go out of session the end of this week. That means all these people will languish for the summer, not knowing whether, in fact, they can be deported back to a country in which

they may well lose their life or their liberty. That is pretty outrageous. If we can't get it done this week, I hope to God we can get it done in September. If not, I worry about a continuing crisis that will only lead to greater uncertainty and create greater risk to those simply fleeing freedom and who are being, by the way, very productive citizens here while they are temporarily in our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for his statement and leadership on this issue.

It is time. When you think about the circumstances, I am reminded of when I was in Caracas last year. It was 11 p.m. at night after I finished with this dinner with the opposition leaders. As I was headed back to the hotel, I saw long lines of people standing by ATM machines at 11 p.m. at night. I asked what that was all about. Well, they are facing hyperinflation in Venezuela—1 million percent, whatever it may be. Every day, these people have to stand in line to withdraw the maximum amount from their savings accounts so the next morning they have enough money to take the bus to work. That is the circumstance. The economy of this country has collapsed.

The medical care, which you mentioned, and I found at this children's hospital and other places, is virtually nonexistent. Diseases, which were once eradicated in Venezuela, are returning. Children are dying from diseases which long ago we believed were gone. Now they are back because there is no vaccine, nothing to treat these children.

When we ask the Trump administration, which has told us they want to get rid of Maduro, to give the Venezuelans a chance at a free election; when we ask them, will you at least show some sympathy for the Venezuelans in the United States who don't want to return, who want temporary protection until this political mess is over—when we ask them will you give them that protection, we get a letter from Mr. Cuccinelli, who is now the head of citizen services, saying: No, we are not going to do that.

How can you have it both ways? How can you say you care for the people of Venezuela, you acknowledge the terrible circumstances of their leader, Maduro, yet when it comes to those in the United States, you force them to return to this circumstance?

As you just described, for many of them, you are forcing the return to a circumstance which is threatening, if not deadly, with 7,000 already killed by their secret police and who knows how many have not been reported who could have been victims as well.

Today we made this request on the floor. A Republican Senator objected. The next time I am going to come to the floor, I will ask our Republican cosponsors to join us. This is a bipartisan effort to try to protect these Venezuela

people. If they will come join us, perhaps the leadership on the Republican side will have second thoughts and give these people of Venezuela a chance to be protected here until their country is safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, one final comment to my colleague. The 7,000 who have been killed by Maduro's secret police is reflective of the fact that those who are here are some of the earliest opponents of Maduro—those who tried to create change but fled. They have a heightened reason why, in fact, going back—in addition to the chaos and in addition to the danger—they are particularly threatened, at the end of the day, because they are the ones who were trying to create change and found a situation in which the threat of their life was at risk so they came to the United States.

Getting protected status—if there was ever a moment in which temporary protected status was envisioned, it is for this situation.

I yield the floor.

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

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

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I always find that the end of the July work period in Washington, DC, is a good time to take stock of the year so far.

I am looking forward to getting out of DC in the next few days and heading home to South Dakota. I am lucky enough to get to meet with South Dakotans on most weekends, but congressional recesses provide me with unbroken blocks of time to spend in the State and hear about South Dakotans' needs and priorities.

It has been a busy year here in Washington, DC, so far. In the last 7 months, the Senate has worked to confirm nearly 50 well-qualified judges, has provided funding to address the humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border, has given our military the resources it needs to defend the country, and much more.

I am proud that in May, by an overwhelming bipartisan margin, the Senate passed my bill to address illegal and abusive robocalls. My legislation would increase the financial penalties for making illegal robocalls, and it would give law enforcement more tools to go after these scammers who prey on vulnerable populations. The TRACED Act, which is my bill to address illegal robocalls, is one of more than 80 pieces of legislation I have introduced or cosponsored this year. My

robocall bill grew out of the work that I did on the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, which I have served on now for 11 years, including having served four of those years as chairman.

My serving on the Commerce Committee has given me an up-close look at the issue of consumer privacy. Last year, as chairman of that committee, I convened hearings into consumer data privacy and the accessing of millions of Facebook users' personal data by the political intelligence firm Cambridge Analytica. I also led a hearing to discuss the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation and California's new privacy-related law.

This year, as chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet, I have continued to focus on consumer privacy. I recently convened a hearing to look at the use of persuasive technology on internet platforms like Facebook and YouTube and on how these technologies can be and have been abused. I believe that developing bipartisan consumer privacy legislation needs to be a priority, and it is an issue I will continue to focus on here in Congress.

Another thing on which I have focused on the Commerce Committee is paving the way for 5G technology, which is the next phase of the wireless revolution, and of ensuring that Americans in rural communities have access to the same broadband technology that residents of more urban areas enjoy.

Last year, the President signed my bipartisan MOBILE NOW Act into law, which I introduced to help secure an adequate spectrum for 5G technology. In June, I reintroduced my STREAMLINE Small Cell Deployment Act in order to address the other part of the 5G equation, and that is infrastructure. Among other things, the STREAMLINE Small Cell Deployment Act will make it more affordable to bring 5G to rural areas by addressing the cost of small cell deployment.

I am privileged to represent South Dakota's farmers and ranchers here in the U.S. Senate, and year after year, one of my major priorities has been to make sure that the needs of our Nation's farmers and ranchers have been addressed. One of my priorities right now is to push for the passage of the United States-Mexico-Canada Free Trade Agreement here in Congress. Farmers and ranchers have been through a few tough years, and one of the things they tell me they need the most is market access for their products around the globe. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve farmers' access to two of our Nation's most significant agricultural export markets—Canada and Mexico—and will substantially expand market access for U.S. dairy products in Canada. It will expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers, and it will make it easier for U.S. producers to export wheat to Canada.

Senate Republicans are ready to pass this agreement as soon as the President formally submits it to Congress. We are just waiting for the Democrats in the House, who—despite the significant steps that have been taken to address their priorities—have still not indicated they are ready to take up the agreement. I will continue to urge them to take up this agreement so that our Nation's farmers and ranchers can experience the benefits. I will also continue to push for swift conclusions to the other trade agreements the administration is negotiating.

Being a Member of Congress doesn't just allow you to push for legislation. It also gives you an important platform on which to advocate on your constituents' behalf with the President and his administration. This year I was able to help persuade the Department of Agriculture to move the hay and grazing date to September 1 of this year for cover crops on prevent plant acres. This will allow farmers and ranchers in Northern States like South Dakota to sow cover crops without worrying that they will not be able to harvest or graze them before the winter weather sets in.

Both here in Congress and with multiple Presidential administrations, I have been advocating for higher blends of ethanol for more than a decade, and I was very pleased this year to know the Trump administration moved to lift the ban on the year-round sale of E15, which is a 15-percent ethanol blended fuel. This is a big win for American consumers, for our growing energy independence, and especially for U.S. corn producers, including those back home in South Dakota. Corn producers are thankful that the President delivered on his commitment to the year-round sales of E15.

Yet it is still a tough environment for agriculture. That is why we need to update the EPA's emissions modeling to reflect ethanol's 40-percent reduction in life cycle greenhouse gasses, which will boost its export potential. Most pressing, the administration needs to curb the issuance of small refinery waivers, which are, in part, forcing ethanol plants to slow down, idle, or shutter across America's heartland. This is critical to our seeing through the President's commitment to farmers.

Throughout my time in the Senate, I have been proud to advocate for Ellsworth Air Force Base, which is near Rapid City, SD. I have spent years working with the other members of the South Dakota delegation in Ellsworth and with community leaders to build up Ellsworth. Among other things, our efforts have resulted in the expansion of the Powder River Training Complex into the largest training airspace in the continental United States. Undoubtedly, it is partly thanks to this airspace that, this May, Ellsworth was chosen as the first home for the future B-21 bomber, and it will host both training and operational squadrons. I

am very proud of Ellsworth for receiving these exciting new missions, and I look forward to there being more great developments for Ellsworth in the future.

I have worked on a lot of other bills this year to make life better for South Dakotans and for the American people. I have introduced tax reform bills to help small businesses, to update the Tax Code for the 21st century economy, to encourage charitable giving, and to permanently protect family farms from the death tax. I have introduced legislation to strengthen the agricultural economy, to support the Second Amendment, to help States like South Dakota—those that have low unemployment rates—to address workforce shortages, and much more. There is a lot more to come.

This fall, I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue building on the economic progress that we have made, to tackle our Nation's infrastructure needs, and, among other things, to lower healthcare costs.

I am proud to represent the people of South Dakota here in the U.S. Senate, and I will continue to do everything I can to address South Dakota's priorities and to expand opportunities for South Dakotans and all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Maine.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to highlight the bipartisan work that is underway in the Senate to help Americans who struggle with the high cost of prescription drugs. This problem particularly affects our seniors, 90 percent of whom take at least one prescription drug. It is critical that we continue to build on the momentum of this important pocketbook issue that, I believe, bridges the partisan divide.

Since 2015, as the chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging, I have chaired eight hearings on drug pricing, and we have heard so many heartbreaking stories from people who struggle to afford the medication that they need.

I will never forget standing in line at the pharmacy counter in Bangor, ME, where I live, when the couple ahead of me received a prescription drug and the unwelcomed news that the couple's copay was going to be \$111. The husband turned to his wife and said: "Honey, we simply cannot afford this." They walked away and left that needed prescription on the drug store counter. I told the pharmacist I didn't mean to overhear but that I just happened to be the next in line. I asked him how often this happens, and he gave me the terrible news that it happens every single day.

At a hearing on the skyrocketing price of insulin, we heard compelling testimony from Paul Grant, a father of four who lives in New Gloucester, ME, who discovered one day, because the 90-day supply of insulin for his 13-year-old

son with type 1 diabetes had tripled to more than \$900, that he had to resort to paying out-of-pocket for a much lower cost insulin from Canada without his receiving any credit toward his insurance deductible.

At our hearing on the cost of treating rheumatoid arthritis, Patty Bernard, from Falmouth, ME, testified that her out-of-pocket costs soared from \$10 to \$3,800 per month for Enbrel when she transitioned from employer-sponsored insurance to Medicare. She simply could not afford this expense and had to switch to a different drug that was not self-administered. This switch required her to go to her doctor's office once a month for a 2½-hour infusion, and it did not work nearly as well for her.

At another hearing, we heard from Pam Holt, who was diagnosed with multiple melanoma. Ms. Holt is among the 1 million Medicare beneficiaries who have annual out-of-pocket prescription drug costs that exceed \$5,100, which places her in the catastrophic part of Medicare Part D. Seniors still pay 5 percent of a drug's cost above that threshold, and Ms. Holt had to refinance her home to be able to afford her treatment. The price of her medication is staggering at more than \$250,000 per year, and this is not an optional cost. These are costs that are necessary to preserve the lives and well-beings of, in particular, our seniors.

These stories of Americans like Paul, Patty, Pam, and millions of others who find it extremely difficult to afford the exorbitant costs of the medications they need in order to maintain their health or the health of their loved ones have motivated Congress to act on a bipartisan-bicameral basis.

The Senate's Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, for example, recently approved the Lower Health Care Costs Act, which incorporates more than 14 measures to increase drug price competition and uses market forces to do so. It includes major provisions from the Biologic Patent Transparency Act, which is a bipartisan bill that I coauthored with Senator KAINE and is also cosponsored by Senators BRAUN, HAWLEY, PORTMAN, SHAHEEN, STABENOW, PAUL, and MURKOWSKI. It is intended to prevent drug manufacturers from gaming our patent system.

Patents play a key role in encouraging what can be billions of dollars of investment to bring new drugs from the lab table to a patient's bedside, but the patent system should not be misused to prevent lower priced generic drugs from coming to market once an initial patent has expired. Our bill requires an earlier and greater disclosure of the web of patents that is held by biologic manufacturers, thus making it easier for their competitors, which are known as biosimilar companies, to develop more affordable alternatives without their being stymied by the filing of last-minute new patents that are

intended simply to keep competition out of the marketplace.

It is particularly important that we look at biologics. They have been miracle drugs for many Americans, but they are also the most expensive category of drugs, accounting for approximately 40 percent of total drug costs.

According to former FDA Commissioner Scott Gottlieb, if all of the biosimilars that have been approved by the FDA were successfully marketed in the United States in a timely fashion, Americans would have saved more than \$4.5 billion in 2017. This is an expert calculation from the former FDA Commissioner.

Instead, what happens in too many cases is that the biosimilar competitor is available now in Europe or in Canada but not in the United States.

The HELP Committee package also includes the CREATES Act, which addresses anti-competitive practices of companies that delay or even block access to a sufficient quantity of the brand name drug to conduct the bioequivalency test required by the FDA as part of the generic drug approval process.

This addresses one of the problems identified by a major investigation that the Aging Committee undertook in 2016, examining the explosion in prices of off-patent prescription drugs for which there still is no generic equivalent. What we found in some cases is that the brand name manufacturer was making it extremely difficult for the generic competitor to buy up a sufficient quantity of the drug to do these bioequivalency tests that are required as part of the generic approval process. That is just plain wrong.

Due to the provisions in the bill to spur competition, the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—estimates that “the entry of certain generic or biosimilar products could be accelerated by one or two years, on average.” This would make a tremendous difference and would reduce consumer as well as Federal and private insurance spending for prescription drugs.

The point I want to make is that this is just allowing the market to operate as it should, with competition, transparency, and an end to the obstacles and the gaming of the system that prevent lower priced pharmaceuticals.

In addition, the Lower Healthcare Costs Act contains several important provisions to shed light on what is currently a complex and opaque system. In fact, I cannot think of any other product we buy where the price is so opaque and lacking in transparency and in which there are such variations in what the cost may be from plan to plan, from pharmacy to pharmacy, from manufacturer to manufacturer, and that is due to a very complex system that I am going to refer to.

At the Aging Committee's hearing on the high cost of insulin, the American Diabetes Association spoke about the lack of transparency when you trace insulin from the manufacturer to the

pharmacy counter. Keep in mind that insulin was first isolated nearly a century ago, in 1921 in Canada, and the discoverers provided it for only a dollar because they wanted to make it widely available.

The ADA chart illustrated the complexity and the perverse incentives in the supply chain for prescription drugs, and what was clear was that rebates are a key problem in driving up the cost of insulin.

There is a system here that is rife with conflicts of interest. If the manufacturer has a high list price, then the pharmacy benefit manager, who is negotiating on behalf of the insurer, has an incentive to choose that manufacturer's version of insulin rather than another manufacturer's because the pharmacy benefit manager is usually compensated by getting a percentage of the list price.

Well, obviously, the manufacturer wants to have its version of insulin chosen to be offered by the insurer to its customers. So here we have this system, which is rife with conflicts of interest and incentives that encourage higher prices because then the middleman is going to make more money, and that discount that the middleman—the pharmacy benefit manager—is negotiating almost never makes it to the pharmacy counter, to the patient who is purchasing the prescription drug.

Sometimes part of that does, indeed, go to the insurer, which can use it to lower overall premiums slightly, but we are talking about trying to help the person who desperately needs the drug and who is buying it at the pharmacy counter.

As cochairs of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN and I, as well as Senators CRAMER and CARPER, have introduced legislation to address the flaws in the system and to hold PBMs and manufacturers accountable.

We have come up with a bill that would help to reduce the price of insulin, and what a benefit that would be for the parents of children who have type 1 diabetes, for whom insulin is literally a matter of survival. It would also help those older Americans with type II diabetes, some of whom are insulin dependent.

Another significant change included in the Lower Healthcare Costs Act requires significantly more disclosure on the costs, the fees, and the rebate information associated with PBM contracts. It also includes an amendment that was offered by Senator BALDWIN, which I supported, to require more reporting of drug prices to the Department of Health and Human Services and a justification for why prices have increased.

These provisions all build on a law that I authored last year to block pharmacy gag clauses.

I told the story about the pharmacist who was so frustrated because so many people, day after day, were unable to afford the copays or the deductibles on

their needed prescription drugs. Well, I met with a group of community pharmacists who told me how the system worked, and they told me that there were actually gag clauses in their contracts where they were prohibited from sharing with the consumer whether it was cheaper to pay out-of-pocket rather than through insurance.

Well, I am pleased to say, in working with former Senator Claire McCaskill and DEBBIE STABENOW and others, we were able to get gag clause prohibitions enacted into law last year. According to one study, banning these gag clauses could help Americans save money in nearly one out of four prescription transactions. So this is significant legislation.

I talked recently to a pharmacist in Maine who said what a relief it was to her to now be able to volunteer to her patients that there may be a less expensive way for the patient to purchase needed prescription drugs.

One out of four—nearly one out of four—prescription transactions should benefit from the laws that we wrote last year.

Another bill that I authored in 2017 will promote more competition from lower priced but equally effective generic drugs, and it is already showing promise. To date, the FDA has granted nearly 200 application requests under the new, expedited pathway that my law provides, and 10 have been approved. That is a much faster pace than in the past.

As cochair of both the Senate Diabetes Caucus and the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I know all too well from listening to families in Maine and across the country that the path toward finding new discoveries and treatments is often long and difficult and that success can be elusive, but we must continue our efforts. When pharmaceutical companies start twisting around the incentives that were designed to encourage innovation and, instead, distorting them into obstacles to competition, Congress simply must act, and that is exactly what we are doing.

I want to applaud the work of the HELP Committee. All of us contributed to the bill, and we were ably led by Chairman LAMAR ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY. I also want to recognize the hard work of Senator GRAHAM and Senator FEINSTEIN on the Judiciary Committee for the bipartisan package of reforms they produced last month.

Finally, I want to salute the Finance Committee chairman, CHUCK GRASSLEY, and the ranking member, RON WYDEN, for taking bipartisan actions just last week in passing the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act. That has many important provisions in it that will require more disclosure. It includes a bill that Senator CASEY and I have authored, as well as many other important provisions, including putting a medical inflation cap on certain pharmaceuticals.

I know how much the Presiding Officer personally cares about this issue, and he has contributed greatly to this work as well. My hope is that we can build upon this momentum, that we can seize the moment when three different committees of the Senate have all been successful in reporting to the full Senate three bipartisan bills.

Our HELP Committee bill was reported by a vote of 20 to 3. That is remarkable consensus.

Let us bring all of these bills to the Senate floor this fall—or certainly by the end of the year—so that we can deliver real results to the American people by lowering the price of prescription drugs.

We would then be very proud of listening to our constituents and addressing a problem that affects millions of Americans.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MICHAEL T. LIBURDI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Liburdi nomination?

Mr. GARDNER. 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 236 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sinema
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Carper	Durbin
Blumenthal	Casey	Feinstein
Brown	Coons	Hassan
Cantwell	Cortez Masto	Heinrich
Cardin	Duckworth	Hirono

Kaine	Peters	Tester
King	Reed	Udall
Leahy	Rosen	Van Hollen
Markey	Schatz	Warner
Menendez	Schumer	Whitehouse
Merkley	Shaheen	Wyden
Murphy	Smith	
Murray	Stabenow	

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Cassidy	Klobuchar	
Gillibrand	Paul	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Peter D. Welte, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Welte 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rosen
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Carper	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Coons	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	King	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sinema
Cramer	Leahy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Tester
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Durbin	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Warner
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—22

Baldwin	Cantwell	Duckworth
Blumenthal	Cardin	Heinrich
Brown	Casey	Hirono

Markey	Schatz	Van Hollen
Menendez	Schumer	Whitehouse
Merkley	Smith	Wyden
Murray	Stabenow	
Reed	Udall	

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Cassidy	Klobuchar	
Gillibrand	Paul	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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 senior assistant 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 James Wesley Hendrix, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Kevin Cramer, Mike Crapo, Marco Rubio, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, James M. Inhofe, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Boozman, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the Hendrix nomination, all postcloture time expire at 2:45 p.m. today and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

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 James Wesley Hendrix, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Alexander	Graham	Risch
Baldwin	Grassley	Roberts
Barrasso	Hassan	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rosen
Blunt	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson	Schumer
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sinema
Cooms	Leahy	Smith
Cornyn	Lee	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sullivan
Cotton	McConnell	Sullivan
Cramer	McSally	Tester
Crapo	Menendez	Thune
Cruz	Merkley	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Duckworth	Murkowski	Udall
Durbin	Murphy	Van Hollen
Enzi	Murray	Warner
Ernst	Perdue	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wicker
Fischer	Portman	Young
Gardner	Reed	

NAYS—5

Blumenthal	Hirono	Wyden
Brown	Markey	

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Cassidy	Klobuchar	
Gillibrand	Paul	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 85, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James Wesley Hendrix, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MAIDEN SPEECH

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam President, I rise today to give my maiden speech as the 14th Senator to represent our great State of Arizona.

It is an honor to be serving Arizona in the United States Senate and humbling to be appointed to serve in the seat held by Senator John McCain. Like most of my life, I didn't take the traditional path, but I am blessed to have been given the opportunity to make a difference for others and stand in this historic Chamber today.

I love Arizona—the Grand Canyon State—its people, and our spirit. Like many Arizonans, I wasn't born there, so this is a love of choice. Also like many Arizonans, I first came to the State on a military assignment in the summer of 1990 to attend pilot training at Williams Air Force Base, now home to a thriving industrial park called Mesa Gateway.

I fell in love with Arizona right away and was fortunate to have the majestic view from the sky as a pilot. What a privilege to live in a land of adventure that I had only read about as a kid, home to one of the seven natural wonders of the world in the Grand Canyon and our diverse landscapes, mountains, canyons, lakes, rivers, sunsets, and the powerful desert lightning.

After an assignment away, I came back to Arizona to fly the A-10 Warthog at Davis Monthan Air Force Base. I can tell you, from experience, there is nothing quite like finishing a demanding training mission on the Barry Goldwater Air Force Range and having a near heavenly view of Arizona's beautiful red sunsets.

It isn't only our climate and beautiful landscapes that make Arizona a great place to live and work. We Arizonans are known for our fierce independence, resilience, heartiness, hard work, faith, and diversity. It is this legacy of service and patriotism that transcends generations.

They say the best comes last, and that couldn't be truer when it comes to Arizona. We were the last in the continental United States to become a State in 1912 and have a history of attracting adventurous hard-working people searching to live out their dreams.

Our State motto is "Ditat Deus," or "God enriches," highlighting the importance of faith in God in our past and our future.

The original foundation of our economy is known as the five Cs: copper, cattle, cotton, citrus, and climate. Today, we still have Morenci mine, the largest copper producer in North America, which I recently visited.

Arizona has made history in our own unique way. We are known around the world for the famous town Tombstone and the legendary OK Corral. We gave women the right to vote 8 years before the whole Nation and are the proud home to Sandra Day O'Connor, the first woman ever to serve on the Supreme Court.

Arizona has always proudly hosted and supported our troops and remains crucial for our defense. Our vast open land, beautiful weather, and airspace makes our State a national security treasure, and Arizonans have always answered the call to serve in uniform and support our vets.

Arizona is home to 22 federally recognized Tribes and has the largest percentage of Tribal geography in any State. The Old Oraibi Hopi Village is

the oldest continuously inhabited settlement in the country, started around 1,000 AD. Piestewa Peak is named after Specialist Lori Ann Piestewa, the first Native-American woman to die in combat while on foreign soil while serving in the U.S. military.

Arizona has a history of punching above our weight with elected leaders. Carl Hayden was our first Congressman turned Senator, who served 56 years and secured funding for the Central Arizona Project to support our water needs. Raul Castro was the first Latino Governor of Arizona and served as U.S. Ambassador to multiple countries. We are home to two Senate heavyweights: Barry Goldwater, who served five terms, and John McCain, who served six terms in this Chamber.

I approach this opportunity to serve in the Senate the same way I approached my 26 years in the Air Force as a fighter pilot and my 4 years in the House. I lost my father at the age of 12, so my life was shaped early on to be treating each day as a gift. In the hospital, shortly before he died, my dad told me to “make him proud.”

My journey to this chapter of service has not been an easy one, but I learned from my dad and my mom, who was left behind with five kids, that hard work, education, faith, and a mindset of service to others are unailing foundations for any endeavor in life.

When I retired from the Air Force, having served both in peace and war, I gave a speech, and I shared some principles and lessons I learned along the way that still ring true today for this new deployment here to the Senate.

First, know your oath. The oath that I took on January 3 as a U.S. Senator is the same oath—the same exact wording—as the one I took as a military officer. The oath and what it represents is what those of us who serve in the military were willing to fight for and, if necessary, die for.

During my 8-year battle with the Pentagon over their policy requiring U.S. servicewomen to be treated like property and wear the Muslim burqa like coverings over them when they were off base in Saudi Arabia, I often felt alone and discouraged. There was extraordinary pressure telling the top four-star brass they are outrageously wrong; and me, a lowly ranking major, had every reason to believe my career would be cut short for taking on the establishment over what I believed was wrong.

At the most anguishing moments in that long fight, I had to ground myself in my oath and why I placed service above self. We were taught as cadets and officers that moral courage means doing the right thing, even if it comes at a great personal cost to you. Trust me, I was tested, but stayed the course.

Subsequently, I sued Donald Rumsfeld, which we all can probably agree, on both sides of the aisle, is not a good career move. Nonetheless, I went on a one-woman lobbying campaign as a regular citizen, which led to legislation

being passed unanimously, signed into law, and resulted in overturning this demeaning discriminatory policy. It took 8 years to win, but by all measures, it was worth it.

I credit that oath. It gave me purpose. It gave me power. It enabled one woman, opposed by the entire Department of Defense, to endure and, as a result, change the world. So this is how I plan to serve Arizona in this body: standing up for what is right in the same fighting spirit that comes with living up to my oath of service.

Next, the question is, is this a job, a career, or a calling? A job brings a paycheck, provides certainty, and pays the bills. A career can sound noble at its surface, but if someone is only focused on a career path and advancement, they can purposefully or inadvertently step on others, not be a good teammate, not rock the boat to do the right thing, make decisions based on fear. A career focus can foster risk aversion and selfish motives. A calling, however, is being a part of something greater than yourself.

Just like my time in uniform and in that message I gave at my retirement, I approach my time here in the Senate as a calling for this season and this moment in time. I get up every day with a focus of what I can do today to make a difference for Arizonans.

Next, don't walk by a problem. It is part of our military culture that, if you are complaining about something, you better be willing to step up and do something about it. God puts us in certain circumstances in order for us to use our energy and our talents to make a difference for others. That is how I went from yelling at the television in my living room to delivering this speech in this hallowed Chamber today.

As I learned from my dad's untimely passing, if these 2 years are the last 2 years of my life, what will I do with them? How can I make this time truly meaningful for those I represent?

The Senate was created to be the world's most deliberative body and designed to be methodical in nature, but it wasn't designed for anonymous holds or partisan bickering to score cheap political points or clicks on stories.

I built a reputation in the House for being a pragmatic problem solver who understands why constituents send people to Washington: to work together, to increase opportunity and prosperity for everyday Americans, and to take a stand when actions go against their best interest. Far too often, too many elected officials lose sight of that goal.

During my retirement ceremony, I concluded with this quote from a renowned fighter pilot named John Boyd. He says:

One day you will come to a fork in the road. And you're going to have to make a decision about which direction you want to go.

He raised his hand and pointed.

If you go that way you can be somebody. You will have to make compromises and you will have to turn your back on friends. But

you will be a member of the club and you will get promoted and you will get good assignments.

Then Boyd raised his other hand and pointed in another direction.

Or you can go that way and you can do something—something for your country and for your Air Force and for yourself. If you decide you want to do something, you may not get promoted and you may not get the good assignments and you certainly will not be a favorite of your superiors. But you won't have to compromise yourself. You will be true to your friends and to yourself. And your work might make a difference. To be somebody or to do something. In life there is often a roll call. That's when you will have to make a decision. To be, or to do? Which way will you go?

That question is what should be posed to all of us who serve in this Chamber today. It is no secret my path is to take action and do something. I would ask my fellow Senators to join me to do something with this precious time we have been given. I already know so many of you feel the same and are driven to serve. Let's point in the direction of do.

There are only 1,983 people who have served as United States Senators. How many can you name? As for me, but a fraction. Except for a few extraordinary exceptions, no one is going to remember our names when we are no longer here. We will go back to being regular citizens, so it is about service now, not self—to do something that matters.

Arizonans, like people all over the country, are tired of the gridlock. They want Congress to work for them, not the other way around. Many people here want to protect this institution, but the American people have basically lost faith in these bodies and those serving in them.

Our approval rating is pathetically low and is likely credited to family members and paid staff. To point the direction of John Boyd's challenge of doing something, we must commit today to stop the dysfunction, break the gridlock, stop spinning, stop obstructing, start truly working on behalf of the American people.

Yes, we live in divided times, but there is always more that unites us than divides us.

Since I took this oath on January 3, my first mission in the Senate was to visit all 15 counties in Arizona to listen to my constituents' priorities and challenges. It was a “2 ears and 1 mouth” tour—used proportionally. Despite the diversity of our State, there was tremendous common ground on so many major issues and priorities.

Arizonans want us to promote policies to ensure, if they work hard, they will be able to provide for their family, get ahead, and meet their full potential. They want to make sure our country is safe for them and their children. They want a life of dignity and respect for one another. They want us to give our military men and women everything they need to do their mission and take care of them and their families when they are done serving.

That is why I am going to continue to fight to protect the A-10 Warthog at Davis Monthan and fight for the F-35 at Luke Air Force Base, plus other amazing military installations that we have and their unique missions in Arizona. It is why, since taking office, I have visited numerous veteran service organizations, like U.S. VETS, where I heard real stories from veterans who struggle with homelessness and addiction who have since been helped off the street and have been able to start a new life for themselves.

Arizonans want us to solve the border crisis and stop playing political games with it. It is a crisis all too real for cities like Yuma, where I saw firsthand the place where over 300 migrants illegally crossed the border due to poor infrastructure and lack of resources for agents, or like Douglas and Nogales, where outdated facilities leave agents overwhelmed with volume and leave our country vulnerable to illegal trafficking of drugs or people.

Arizonans want us to work together to bring down the out-of-pocket costs of healthcare and allow patients, families, and doctors—not the government or insurance companies—to make healthcare choices for them. We can do this by protecting preexisting conditions and supporting initiatives like association health plans, which allow groups like the Southern Arizona Chamber of Commerce Association to partner small businesses together to access health insurance plans that right now only big companies can.

Lives will be saved with the medical innovation that is happening in my State. Arizona is home to many institutions that are leading the way to find new treatments and cures for deadly diseases.

When I visited the Ivy Brain Tumor Center, I was inspired by the story of Catherine Ivy, whose husband Ben passed away from glioblastoma, the same deadly cancer that took the life of Senator McCain. Instead of being consumed with her grief, Catherine searched all over the world for the best place to invest and partner for groundbreaking innovation to conquer this disease.

She found it at the Barrow Neurological Institute right there in our own State of Arizona. Dr. Nader Sanai and his team are doing amazing work and leading in cutting-edge research and clinical trials. We need more investments and less barriers for initiatives like this.

Arizonans want us to continue to tackle the opioid epidemic that is disproportionately impacting our rural communities. During my 15-county tour, I met Jason Kouts, the mayor of Safford, who shared the senseless death of his son Josiah whom his family lost to an opioid addiction. His life and all its potential tragically ended with a fentanyl-laced heroin dose. We mourn for his family and pledge to end this crisis.

Arizonans want us to smartly invest in infrastructure for the long haul, not

in a one-size-fits-all approach. What they need in New Jersey is not necessarily what we need in Arizona. We need flexibility and partnerships with States. Cities in both the West and East Valley of Maricopa County have been tasked with the daunting feat of keeping up with the fastest population growth in the country but without the resources to modernize their streets and freeways. We need bipartisan solutions to modernize our infrastructure, including water infrastructure and rural broadband.

Arizonans want us to ensure that our freedoms and opportunities are preserved for their children and their grandchildren. They want us to ensure that seniors can have retirement security after working their whole lives.

We can solve some of these problems in the days ahead if we choose to—if we choose to work together and do something bigger for those we all serve.

At this moment in history, as John Boyd said, we are at a fork in the road, and we have a choice: Be someone or do something. I choose to act for those I serve. I know you do too. So let's get to work for the Nation.

As Senator McCain once said: "Americans never quit. We never surrender. We never hide from history. We make history."

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON JAMES WESLEY HENDRIX NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

All time is expired.

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

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Blackburn	Braun
Baldwin	Blunt	Brown
Barrasso	Boozman	Burr

Cantwell	Hoeven	Romney
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Cardin	Inhofe	Rounds
Carper	Johnson	Rubio
Casey	Jones	Sasse
Collins	Kaine	Schatz
Coons	Kennedy	Schumer
Cornyn	King	Scott (FL)
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Leahy	Shaheen
Cramer	Lee	Shelby
Crapo	Manchin	Sinema
Cruz	McConnell	Smith
Daines	McSally	Stabenow
Duckworth	Menendez	Sullivan
Durbin	Merkley	Tester
Enzi	Moran	Thune
Ernst	Murkowski	Tillis
Feinstein	Murphy	Toomey
Fischer	Murray	Udall
Gardner	Paul	Van Hollen
Graham	Perdue	Warner
Grassley	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Portman	Wicker
Hawley	Reed	Wyden
Heinrich	Risch	Young
Hirono	Roberts	

NAYS—1

Blumenthal

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Cassidy	Klobuchar	
Gillibrand	Markey	

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 shall 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 Sean D. Jordan, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Sean D. Jordan, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET),

the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Tillis
Enzi	Moran	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NAYS—36

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warner
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Cassidy	Klobuchar	
Gillibrand	Markey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 36.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sean D. Jordan, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, recently, I joined the Senate delegation to visit the southern border and view firsthand the migration and humanitarian crisis facing the United States.

We visited the Donna Holding Facility, the Catholic Charities Respite Center, the McAllen Border Patrol Station, and the Ursula Centralized Processing Center. Earlier this week, I held a roundtable discussion on my trip at the Sacred Heart of Jesus Church in Highlandtown. The group was organized by the Latino Providers Network in Baltimore, which included rep-

resentatives from the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Catholic Relief Services, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, and other nonprofits in the community that do work in Baltimore and at our border.

I was impressed by the Catholic Charities Respite Center run by Sister Norma Pimentel. The center provides a warm meal, a shower, a change into clean clothes, medicine, and other desperately needed supplies. These migrants are very lucky to make it there.

What I saw in McAllen, by contrast, was very disturbing. I saw many families huddled together in overcrowded conditions. I saw children behind fencing and, basically, in cages. Some children wore clothing that was soiled and had not been changed since they arrived in the United States. Children and families were supposed to be there in temporary holding only for a day or two, but we heard stories that families are being held for up to 10 to 14 days and, in some cases, even longer.

Why are migrants leaving their homes in the first place? These individuals are desperate. They are desperate because they are fleeing violence and persecution in their home countries. These families are often given a terrible choice to have their young son or daughter join a criminal gang or suffer the consequences as a family. That means being attacked, kidnapped, and even murdered. Even though it is a dangerous journey, these families feel they have no choice.

Let me remind my colleagues that these individuals are lawfully seeking asylum at our border and should not be treated as criminals. We need to respect their human rights, their rights under international law, and their rights under U.S. law.

These migrants are not trying to do harm to the United States. Indeed, government officials told us that the vast majority of those screened present no safety risk, such as being on a watch list for terrorist or criminal behavior, and that most migrants have not tried previously to enter the country illegally.

I am gravely concerned about the new metering system used by Customs and Border Protection for those seeking asylum and refuge in our country as part of the expansion of the Remain in Mexico program. Normally, a migrant would present themselves to a Customs or Border Patrol agent at the point of entry and ask to seek asylum. But under the Trump administration's new metering policy, Border Patrol agents will stop migrants at the border, oftentimes halfway across the bridge as they approach a legal border point of entry. Border Patrol will then give the migrant a number, and they will have to then wait for their number to be called before they can formally present themselves for admission at a legal point of entry.

How long is the wait for your number to be called? In some cases, it is weeks or even months. In the meantime, mi-

grants are told to wait in a border town and tent city set up on the other side of the border. One of most dangerous towns in all of Mexico is Reynosa, just across the border from McAllen Border Patrol Station. Migrants staying in these tent cities are subjected to violence, extortion, human trafficking, and even death at the hands of gangs that operate with impunity in the city, which are effectively not controlled by Mexican law enforcement authorities. In fact, the town is so dangerous that U.S. law enforcement personnel are forbidden by our government from visiting there or trying to meet with migrants on the Mexican side of the border. This is outrageous, and America can do better to live up to our values.

Migrants who are desperately fleeing violence and prosecution at home come to the United States in search of safety for themselves and their families. Now they are told they must wait indefinitely on the Mexican side of the border in, essentially, a lawless town where they are at the mercy of criminals, gangs, and traffickers who prey on the most vulnerable.

What happens next? Many of these migrants decide they have no choice but to cross the border illegally so that they can escape the camps in Reynosa. When migrants try to cross the border illegally, they face new dangers of dehydration, drowning, and even death.

Under the Trump administration, the United States is undermining our asylum policy and America's leadership in the world in welcoming refugees and those fleeing violence and persecution in their home countries. Indeed, the Trump administration is deliberately trying to hurt migration and legitimate asylum seekers and refugees by making it more difficult to seek asylum and deter refugees from coming to the United States in the first place. Proposed asylum law changes, such as expansion of the Remain in Mexico and metering policies, will make it more difficult for asylum seekers to apply if they have traveled through multiple countries as they make their way to the United States.

I believe asylum law should be changed to make it easier for migrants to apply in their home country, if safe, and expeditiously get an asylum determination from the U.S. Embassy so that they do not have to make the dangerous journey to the United States and try to cross our border with the uncertainty of what awaits them once they reach the U.S. border.

I am concerned, as well, that migrants who do not ultimately make it through the process of applying for asylum may not receive proper notice of their hearings before an asylum judge to make their case. These are people who are released in our country but have to show up for a hearing. The notices may be given out in English, which many migrants cannot read. The address may be incorrect or outdated in terms of where the migrant is heading in the United States to await their

asylum hearing before the judge. In other words, the information may be inaccurate, and they never get the notices to appear. They are therefore out of status and never had a chance to make their case.

NGOs in Texas made a strong case to our delegation to reinstate the Family Case Management Program, which the Trump administration has canceled. They explained that if ICE reinstated this program, we could see 99 percent compliance with immigration court orders without the need for expanded detention and overcrowding. This compliance rate is backed up by the track record and statistics of the Department of Homeland Security itself when the program was in use. This program is a promising alternative to detention that should be expanded instead of canceled by the Trump administration.

Let me say a word about the Border Patrol agents themselves. They are trying to do their jobs under difficult circumstances. The main problem is the Trump administration's asylum policies, not the Border Patrol agents. I hope that the recent emergency supplemental appropriations measure passed by Congress and signed by the President will help in terms of providing better and more humane care to children in Health and Human Services Department custody, under the auspices of the Office of Refugee Resettlement. The measure seeks to improve conditions for migrants in the Department of Homeland Security's custody by addressing the dangerous overcrowding found by the Department of Homeland Security's inspector general. The bill improves due process for migrants and seeks to ease the immigration court backlog by hiring new immigration judges to hear cases and giving migrants greater access to the legal orientation program.

What should Congress do to address the immediate needs of migrants, particularly the children, as well as addressing the root cause of this humanitarian crisis? I am a cosponsor of the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act. This bill would provide guardrails and minimum standards for the treatment of children and families, ensuring that government funds are not used to traumatize or harm asylum seekers. It would do so by dramatically reducing family separations, setting health and safety standards, ending the operation of refugee shelters by for-profit contractors, making it easier to place children with sponsors, and ensuring that unaccompanied children have access to legal counsel.

In terms of root causes, I have joined with my colleagues in introducing the Central America Reform and Enforcement Act designed to address the endemic violence and humanitarian crises that are driving immigration from Central America and also to smooth the path of those seeking asylum in this country. This bill would condition assistance to the Northern Triangle governments in order to address the

root causes of the violence and instability that are driving migration and crack down on smugglers, cartels, and traffickers exploiting children and families.

This legislation also enhances monitoring of unaccompanied children after they are processed at the border, provides a fair legal process for asylum seekers, and improves immigration court efficiencies. Those are some of the things we can do.

In particular, this legislation would reverse the ill-advised foreign aid cuts made by the Trump administration that are worsening the migration crisis in the Northern Triangle, which includes Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

I am concerned, however, that the President sees immigration and immigrants as a good political issue for the 2020 election. Congress needs a partner to take up and pass comprehensive immigration reform, which I believe could pass comfortably in both Houses if the President of the United States would join us in a constructive manner for comprehensive immigration reform.

This administration has shown just the reverse. The administration has proposed a Muslim ban, canceled temporary protected status, canceled the DACA—Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival—Program for Dreamers, tried to institute an asylum ban, lowered and now seeks to eliminate refugee admissions, increased domestic immigration enforcement for nonviolent offenders, and sought to expand the program of expedited removal of residents in the United States without due process or a court hearing.

In many of these cases, the Trump administration's decisions have been subjected to successful legal challenges in court, and, thankfully, our independent judiciary has largely continued to uphold the rule of law and serves as an important check and balance against the worst excesses of the Trump administration as it disregards our laws and the Constitution.

I therefore urge the President to reverse course and work with Congress on comprehensive immigration reform, which must include sensible border security. Yes, we do need border security. In these times, when we have international terrorism and international drug trafficking, we need to know who is coming into our country. We have to have an orderly way to process those who want to work or live or go to school in the United States. But it must include an asylum policy for families who are at risk in their native country.

Let us build on the proud history of America and welcome those who seek refuge from persecution and want to help build a better America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEBT CEILING

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, as I travel across Montana, I hear from folks who work tirelessly every day to make ends meet.

Many work long hours for too low wages, and they face ever-rising costs in housing and healthcare and other basic necessities, but folks in Montana are resilient, they are resourceful, they know how to live within their means, and they know how important it is to make the numbers add up at the end of the month.

I rise because, as usual, Washington, DC, could learn a lot from Montana. This week, we will vote on a bill that swipes Washington's credit card to the tune of about \$250 billion over the next 2 years—dollars that will come out of the pockets of our kids and our grandkids. Now, this \$250 billion comes on top of the \$1 trillion the United States will add to the national deficit this year because our budget is that far out of whack. The previous year to this year was \$800 billion that we added to the national debt.

So to put that in perspective, that is about \$2.2 trillion in just 2 years. If you are sitting at home wondering, \$2.2 trillion; how much is that, it is far more than \$250 billion.

With \$250 billion, half the students going to college for 4 years would not have to pay anything to go to school in the United States. We are adding \$2.2 trillion, and it is going to continue on until we get our budget in line.

Unfortunately, this sort of reckless spending by both parties has shown a disregard for its impact on the national debt, and it is now the norm in Washington, DC.

Folks on both sides of the aisle are calling for this agreement, and they are calling it a compromise, but in reality, the only thing it will compromise is our children and our grandchildren's future.

Montanans expect me to hold Washington, DC, accountable and fight back against irresponsible spending and poor tax policy. This falls on the irresponsible spending side.

The bipartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget projects that this administration's policies will add \$4 trillion to the debt over the next 10 years. I am here to tell you that is too conservative a figure.

At this point in time, we are going to be adding about \$1.2 trillion to the debt every year if things don't change. Our debt is skyrocketing, and guess what. We are not fixing the healthcare problems that need to be fixed; we are not fixing the high cost of education; we are not investing in our infrastructure, but our debt continues to skyrocket because of irresponsible spending and, quite frankly, a Republican tax giveaway for the wealthy at the expense of our kids and our grandkids.

I have listened to colleagues on both sides of the aisle during my tenure here

who warned of debt and how our national debt could damage our economy and our national security.

Two years ago, my Republican colleagues passed a partisan tax giveaway, drafted behind closed doors, with no—public input from Montanans or anyone else in this country. They promised that this tax giveaway would pay for itself, but it did not. Let me say that one more time. They promised the tax giveaway would pay for itself, but guess what. Just like the previous ones, it didn't.

Instead, it tacked about \$2 trillion onto our national debt, and it is another example of why we can't get our books in order—because we have a shortsighted fiscal approach that makes us the first generation to inherit from our parents and borrow from our kids.

My colleagues made campaign promises to tackle this debt. As a Congressman—as a Congressman—Mick Mulvaney, who happens to be the President's Chief of Staff, pledged to eliminate it, but this White House has done just the opposite.

As we stand here today, the debt has exploded to more than \$22 trillion, and it continues to climb higher every day, despite the country being in the middle of the longest period of economic expansion in our history.

Now, I am going to tell you it is one thing to run a deficit when you are in a recession—it is necessary to bring the economy back—but when you are in the longest period of economic expansion in this country's history, we should be paying down that debt, and we are not. We are adding to it as if we were in a recession.

Running trillion-dollar deficits during times of growth like this one, and everybody in this body knows it, puts the economy on a sugar high. It feels good now, but we all know it is not sustainable, and a crash is inevitable.

The same folks who voted to pile \$2 trillion onto the deficit now argue—some of them—that we cannot find the money to provide our veterans with the healthcare they have earned. They say we need deep cuts—deep cuts—into Medicaid and Social Security and other programs that many folks have paid into for their entire life, but yet we are going to cut them.

I have known, and we all know, that budgets and spending are about priorities, and it is clear that Congress's priorities are out of whack.

You wouldn't know it from watching C-SPAN, but it is possible to be fiscally conservative without cutting working folks off at the knees. I know this because, as president of the Montana Senate, I negotiated and passed a balanced budget because the State constitution requires it. Since coming to the U.S. Senate, I have led a push to add a constitutional amendment requiring that Congress pass a balanced budget.

Now, look, we all know it can't be done overnight, but in a measured ap-

proach, with bipartisan cooperation, we can at least get headed in the right direction. There is no reason why we cannot make smart investments in working families, our kids' education, 21st century infrastructure, and the other needs across this country without bankrupting future generations. Folks in the Treasure State know that, and Washington, DC, needs to know that too. It is time for Congress to follow Montana's lead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I may require.

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

HEALTHCARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I often recommend to Tennesseans that they look at the U.S. Congress as if it were a split-screen television set.

Here is what I mean by that. During the last month, on one side of the screen you saw the usual Washington, DC, turmoil—Trump versus the squad, Mueller testifying, impeachment votes, battle over the border, Presidential candidates posturing, and of course the daily tweets.

On the other side of the screen was the President and congressional leaders agreeing to a 2-year budget that will strengthen our military, help our veterans, fund research for medical miracles, fund research for our National Laboratories, support our national parks, and save taxpayers a boatload of money by providing stability in funding.

I might add that this part of the budget—31 percent of the budget—is not the part of the budget that is creating the budget deficit. This part of the budget that we will be voting on tomorrow has gone up at about the rate of inflation for the last 10 years and is projected by the Congressional Budget Office to go up at about the rate of inflation for the next 10 years.

It is the entitlement part of the budget that is the problem, which is why I am voting for what the President and the congressional leaders have recommended, but then also on that side of the screen, away from the Washington, DC, turmoil, there was another story, which is the story I want to talk about today.

During that last same month, three Senate committees, by my count, made more than 80 bipartisan proposals, sponsored by at least 75 U.S. Senators of both political parties, to reduce the cost of healthcare that Americans pay for out of their own pockets.

On June 26, after 17 hearings, 6 months of work, recommendations from 400 experts, our Health Committee, which I chair and of which Senator PATTY MURRAY, the Democrat from Washington State, is the ranking member, voted 20 to 3 to recommend to the full Senate 55 proposals from 65 Senators that would end surprise med-

ical billing, increase transparency so you can know the cost of your medical care—you can't lower your healthcare costs if you don't know your healthcare actually costs—and increase competition to reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

The next day after our Health Committee reported that legislation, the Judiciary Committee, headed by Senator GRAHAM and Senator FEINSTEIN, reported out 4 proposals from 19 Senators that would reduce prescription drug costs by banning anticompetitive behaviors by drug manufacturers and helping the Federal Trade Commission to block those who game the citizen petition process to delay generic drugs and biosimiliars.

Then, last Thursday, the Finance Committee—this one headed by Senator GRASSLEY and Senator WYDEN—by a vote of 19 to 9, reported more than two dozen additional bipartisan proposals also aimed at reducing the cost of prescription drugs.

That is not all. The House Energy and Commerce Committee has passed its own solution to surprise billing.

Last Thursday, Senator MURRAY's staff and I met with Representatives FRANK PALLONE and GREG WALDEN, the leaders of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. The four of us agreed to work together to lower healthcare costs.

All of this work is consistent with what Secretary Azar and the President have been saying and doing to lower prescription drug costs and increase transparency.

For example, last week, after the Finance Committee released its legislation, the White House said it "is encouraged by the bipartisan work of Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator WYDEN to craft a comprehensive package to lower outrageously high drug prices, and today we are engaging with coalitions to help build support." That is from the White House.

Here is why this amount of activity is, in so many ways, such a good sign for the American people. In our committee, what we have seen before with fixing No Child Left Behind, 21st Century Cures Act, last year's response to the opioid crisis—the last of which occurred, by the way, while on the other side of the split-screen television was the acrimonious Kavanaugh confirmation hearing—what we have seen with these recent new laws I just mentioned is that when that many Senators and that many Congressmen of both political parties go to work together on a big issue that affects millions of American people, there is likely to be a result that affects the American people.

In other words, I believe legislation to end surprise medical billing, increase transparency, and lower prescription drug costs is looking like a train that will get to the station when Congress reconvenes in September, and well it should.

The cost of healthcare is Americans' No. 1 financial concern, according to

Gallup, and at one hearing before our Health Committee, experts from the National Academy of Medicine testified that up to half of what our country spends on healthcare is unnecessary.

That is such a startling fact that I sat down then with Senator MURRAY and with Senators GRASSLEY and WYDEN and with Senators GRAHAM and FEINSTEIN, and I said to the leaders of those committees: Surely, if the experts say that half of what we are spending is unnecessary, Democrats and Republicans can find some things we can agree on that reduce the cost of what we pay for healthcare out of our own pocket, and we have.

The work of these three committees, more than 80 proposals from 75 Senators, is the result of that work over the last 6 months.

Let me say a word about perhaps the most visible proposal in the Health Committee's bill. Surprise medical billing is one of the most urgent problems that the House, the Senate, and the President are trying to fix.

After about 20 percent of all emergency room visits, patients are surprised a few months later to receive an unexpected bill. It could range from \$300 to \$3,000 to \$30,000. This happens because patients see a doctor they didn't choose, either because of emergency care at an out-of-network hospital or because an out-of-network doctor, not chosen by the patient, treats them at an in-network hospital.

In his State of the Union Address and again at a White House event in May, President Trump called for an end to surprise billing. At the event, he gave me a copy of this medical bill, which we have enlarged on this chart. It was a bill sent to Liz Moreno, a Texas college student who had back surgery, and during a postsurgery followup visit, her doctor ordered a urine test. A year later, this bill showed up: \$17,850 for a urine test. That is about the price of a new Nissan Sentra. The bill was sky high because the lab that ran the test—a lab Liz did not choose—was considered out of network by her insurer.

Take Drew Calver, a Texan who told the President his story about getting \$110,000 in bills—the emergency room he was rushed to during his heart attack was out of network and so were the doctors who treated him.

That day, the President said: "For too long, surprise billings . . . have left some patients with thousands of dollars of unexpected and unjustified charges. . . . So this must end."

The Lower Health Care Costs Act the Senate Health Committee passed last month by a vote of 20 to 3 would have protected Liz and Drew from receiving those surprise bills. Here is how it works: Insurance companies would pay out-of-network doctors a local, market-driven benchmark rate, which would be the same local, market-based rate that insurers negotiated with doctors who agreed to be in network. Obviously, this would have saved Liz and Drew because they wouldn't have gotten a surprise medical bill.

The Congressional Budget Office says that by ending surprise medical billing, this approach would generally lower health insurance premiums. CBO also estimates that the approach would save taxpayers \$25 billion over the next 10 years.

Based on data from Kaiser, only about 5 percent of doctors at 10 percent of hospitals send most of these surprise medical bills. So our solution primarily affects those doctors whom patients have little control over choosing—anesthesiologists, radiologists, pathologists, emergency room doctors, and neonatologists. It does not affect doctors whom a patient can choose, such as cardiologists or primary care doctors or pediatricians. In fact, the American Academy of Family Physicians, representing primary care doctors, supports our Lower Health Care Costs Act that ends surprise medical billing.

Over the 17 hearings our Health Committee conducted in developing our legislation, we heard many stories about surprise billing. Here are a few.

Todd, a Knoxville father who wrote me, took his son to the emergency room after a bicycle accident. Todd was surprised when a few months later he received a bill for \$1,800—because, even though the emergency room was in network, the doctor who treated his son was not.

Ahead of the birth of their first child, Danny and his wife Linda, from Georgia, chose an in-network doctor and hospital. Of course, they thought their insurance would cover their bills. When Luke was born 3 weeks premature, he had to spend 11 days at the in-network hospital's neonatal care center. In the weeks after Luke went home, \$4,279 in bills were sent to Danny and Linda because the neonatal care center, located in their in-network hospital, was out of network.

Carrie Wallinger, from Phoenix, AZ, received a \$9,000 surprise medical bill after going to an in-network emergency room after her dog bit her finger. The doctor who came to stitch up her finger was from an out-of-network facility, and so she got an unexpected \$9,000 surprise bill.

A South Carolina woman who had to have an emergency C-section received a \$15,000 bill from an out-of-network anesthesiologist.

Usually when you are being wheeled into an emergency room for an emergency operation, you are not thinking about choosing a doctor, and you are not interviewing them about whether they are in network or out of network.

In Texas, after an ATV crushed his arm, Dr. Naveed Khan, a radiologist, needed advanced medical care. The cost of a 108-mile trip in an out-of-network helicopter cost \$44,631.

Nicole Briggs, from Colorado, had emergency surgery to remove her appendix at an in-network hospital. She owed \$4,727 because the surgeon was out of network.

In Mississippi, Stacy White took her husband to the emergency room at an

in-network hospital. The emergency physician who saw her husband was out of network, and to her surprise, they received a bill for \$2,700.

West Coz, a 3-year-old with a 107-degree fever, was airlifted from a small community in West Virginia to a more advanced hospital 75 miles away. His parents were left with a \$45,000 bill for the helicopter.

In Maine, the State representative who sponsored a bill to protect patients against surprise bills received a several-hundred-dollar bill himself because the radiologist who read his daughter's x-ray was out of network even though he took his daughter to an in-network hospital.

There are many more stories I could tell, but the bottom line is, in each case, this happened because the patient almost always had little choice. If you don't have choice, then you really don't have a functioning market. It is a market failure.

One reason for the uptick in surprise bills is that this market failure is now being exploited by private equity firms. Oftentimes, hospitals will contract with a company to staff their emergency rooms and hospitals. These companies will handle billing, manage schedules, and hire doctors to staff the hospital emergency room.

Here is some research done by Yale economist Zack Cooper. He found that two of the leading staffing companies—both backed by private equity firms—significantly increase the rate of out-of-network billing in a hospital once the firms are hired.

In the case of one of the physician staffing companies that Cooper studied, a large insurer's data showed that the cases of surprise billing increased by 100 percent at six different hospitals once this physician staffing firm took over those hospitals' emergency rooms.

In a New York Times article, Cooper described the 100-percent jump in surprise bills once these private equity-backed staffing companies entered by saying it was "almost . . . like a light switch was being flipped on."

In Axios, Cooper said: "If you're willing to engage in some fairly unsavory billing practices, (these services) could be quite lucrative. . . . That's just discouraging, and it makes people want to go to single payer." These surprise bill abuses make Americans want to go to single payer.

Our goal is to protect patients, not private equity firms and companies that are taking advantage of patients. Surprise medical bills are one of the most visible problems for the 180 million Americans who get their health insurance on the job.

When growing numbers of patients are receiving surprise medical bills that could bankrupt their families, it is time for Congress to act. If Congress can't fix such an obvious market failure in healthcare, pressure will only grow for a radical Federal takeover of healthcare that will take away private insurance from the 180 million Americans who get insurance on the job and

leave patients with less choice, fewer doctors, and worse healthcare.

Avik Roy wrote in *Forbes* that “if we do nothing [to address surprise medical bills], the problem will get far worse. If we do something that is too incremental, we’ll pat ourselves on the back and then be forced to revisit the problem in a few years. Americans deserve market-based alternatives to single-payer health care. Without reform of exploitive hospital prices, we’ll never get there.”

Americans want to be mindful consumers of healthcare. When Todd, the Knoxville father, wrote me, he said: “If I’m expected to be a conscientious consumer of my own health care needs, I need a little more help.” In other words, he needs for Congress to end surprise medical bills.

It is unacceptable to say to patients that, even by paying their premiums every month, even by researching and choosing in-network hospitals and doctors, they may be on the hook for thousands of unexpected dollars because of a surprise bill over which they had no control.

At least 75 Senators and the President of the United States have made it clear that our intent is to end surprise billing and to reduce what Americans pay out of pocket for their healthcare. When Congress reconvenes in September, I would encourage all of my colleagues to support these efforts to reduce healthcare costs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor today with my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Maryland, Mr. CARDIN, and I think we both agree that we would rather not be here today to talk about this subject. But I feel compelled to come to the Senate floor today because, in my view, we have a duty to speak out when the President of the United States of America engages in conduct that brings dishonor and disgrace to the Office of the Presidency. That is what we witnessed, once again, over the weekend when President Trump unleashed a torrent of personal, nasty, and racist attacks on Congressman ELLIJAH CUMMINGS and the city of Baltimore, and President Trump has continued his poisonous barrage for days.

Congressman CUMMINGS can defend himself. He grew up having to confront racist bullies. In the face of these attacks, he has shown great strength and great integrity—the same strength and integrity he has brought to his efforts to fight for his dear city of Baltimore, his entire congressional district, and his constituents over many years.

Baltimore is a great American city with great people, great spirit, and great heart. Yes, of course, Baltimore faces many challenges. It is facing those challenges with determination, with unity, and with grit. The Presi-

dent’s attacks on this great American city have only served to rally the people of Baltimore, the people of Maryland, and, in fact, the people of the United States of America to support the city and the people of Baltimore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an op-ed that appeared in the *Baltimore Sun* today entitled “Baltimore leaders: ‘Proud not only to be in Baltimore, but of Baltimore.’”

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

[From the *Baltimore Sun*, July 30, 2019]

BALTIMORE LEADERS: ‘PROUD NOT ONLY TO BE IN BALTIMORE, BUT OF BALTIMORE’

(By Ronald J. Daniels and Kevin Plank)

We are proud and privileged to call Baltimore home. Baltimore is a city of creativity, optimism, and determination. Home to leading public and private research universities, world-class medical institutions, and a diverse business community, Baltimore is a city where both artists and start-ups thrive. From creating one of the nation’s first racially integrated library systems to producing today’s modern medical and technological breakthroughs, our city has a proud legacy of leadership in improving lives and setting a national example for a stronger tomorrow. It’s no wonder we are often named as a place where millennials are moving and staying. This is a city where people not only want to live, but love to live.

That is why we, as leaders of 10 of Baltimore’s anchor institutions, reject the recent unfair and ungenerous characterizations of our great city and its region. Like so many cities across America, Baltimore is a place of paradox, at once vibrant and full of promise and yet also burdened by the weight of generations of racial and economic inequities, deindustrialization, and disinvestment. Like other cities of our size and history, we face urgent challenges with crime, housing equity and our education system. But like all Americans, Baltimoreans deserve respect, support and steadfast partnership from elected officials at every level.

Baltimore is not and will not be defined by our challenges. What defines us is that we continually meet those challenges with resilience and persistence, that we invest in innovation for Baltimore and for the nation, and that we harness the talent of so many exceptional individuals to create opportunity not for the few, but for the many.

Baltimore’s remarkable people include icons past and present like Supreme Court justice Thurgood Marshall; the longest serving woman in Congress, Sen. Barbara Mikulski; and Rep. Elijah Cummings, outspoken advocate for all his constituents, from west Baltimore to Catonsville and beyond. These leaders are known not only for their deep commitment to our city and communities, but for their stature and public service on the national stage.

We see the promise of Baltimore because we are fortunate to work, serve and live here, alongside our colleagues, employees, students and neighbors. Such promise is proven daily in our shared commitment to our city’s growth and the success of its residents. Baltimore fosters talent in its strong academic institutions and has seen rising venture capital investment in its businesses—a testament to the dynamism and innovative spirit of our businesses large and small. Our leading businesses and non-profits, called upon and supported by our vibrant faith community, launched BLocal, a targeted economic investment and community

development plan that over three years has invested more than \$280 million and hired more than 1,700 Baltimore residents in underserved neighborhoods. BLocal expresses to the fullest the deep and long-term investment of the city’s anchor institutions.

We never move forward as a community—or indeed, a nation—by denigrating each other. Nor does it serve any of us to demean a vibrant city and its citizens who exemplify those most American of qualities: can-do optimism, grit and creativity.

Justice Thurgood Marshall wisely counseled that “In recognizing the humanity of our fellow beings, we pay ourselves the highest tribute.” And as this city has shown, time and again, when we work together, we rise together. For this and so many reasons we are proud not only to be in Baltimore, but of Baltimore.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. This is signed by many of the leaders in our community, including the President of Johns Hopkins University; the head of Under Armour, a great American company; the head of a number of major companies in the city of Baltimore; the Casey Foundation; Morgan State University, a great HBCU; Eddie Brown, one of our great civic leaders; and many other leaders of Baltimore—diverse leaders who have come together to stand up with pride for the city of Baltimore.

I would like to read to the Senate what they say in the first paragraph:

We are proud and privileged to call Baltimore home. Baltimore is a city of creativity, optimism, and determination. Home to leading public and private research universities, world-class medical institutions, and a diverse business community, Baltimore is a city where both artists and start-ups thrive. From creating one of the nation’s first racially integrated library systems to producing today’s modern medical and technological breakthroughs, our city has a proud legacy of leadership in improving lives and setting a national example for a stronger tomorrow.

I want to pay particular attention to these next sentences:

It’s no wonder we are often named as a place where millennials are moving and staying. This is a city where people not only want to live, but love to live.

If you come to Baltimore today, you will, in fact, find lots of young people from other parts of the country coming to settle, work, and raise their families in this great American city. The President may say that nobody wants to live in Baltimore, but the facts show a very different story about young people—young people who understand that they have a great future in Baltimore and are moving to that great city.

Of course, it is true that Baltimore faces a series of problems. In Baltimore we have had a legacy of racial discrimination and segregation.

I would like to read from yesterday’s editorial in the *Baltimore Sun*.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from the *Baltimore Sun*, dated July 29, 2019.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 29, 2019]

CUMMINGS DIDN'T CAUSE BALTIMORE'S WOES; IT WAS PEOPLE WHO PROFITED FROM RACISM. SOUND FAMILIAR, MR. TRUMP?

(By Baltimore Sun Editorial Board)

It's not our job to defend Rep. Elijah Cummings from President Donald Trump's Twitter rants. For one thing, he's quite capable of doing it on his own, and for another, our role isn't to offer blind loyalty to political leaders of any party but to hold them to account. Likewise, we're not in the business of defending Baltimore from any and all criticism. Our city has problems, big ones, and we don't shy away from them, nor do we give any politicians a pass for failing to do as much as humanly possible to fix them. But we are sticklers for facts and perspective, and in case anybody is still interested in those things, we have a few that are worth mentioning.

Mr. Cummings has not single-handedly solved Baltimore's racial and class inequities, its injustices, its blight, its epidemics of lead poisoning and asthma, its violence or, indeed, its problems with rats. And he has been in office for a long time, more than 30 years between Congress and the Maryland House of Delegates. But Baltimore's problems go back a lot farther than that.

President Trump, whose early career was marred by a federal housing discrimination suit, may be interested to know that Baltimore was something of a pioneer in that regard. It enacted the first housing segregation ordinances, which were soon invalidated by the Supreme Court, leading to subtler and more nefarious tactics. Racially restrictive covenants, privately enforced, prevented the sale of homes in certain neighborhoods to minorities. Redlining prevented minorities from getting financing to buy homes in white neighborhoods. And blockbusting made rich the unscrupulous men who capitalized on racism and fear to drive white flight. They profited on blacks who sought security and better opportunities but instead found themselves exploited and impoverished.

Those days aren't nearly so far in the past as we might like to think. Just seven years ago, Baltimore settled a landmark lending discrimination suit against Wells Fargo, which steered minority borrowers into subprime mortgages—the sort of abuse the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which Mr. Trump has eviscerated, might have prevented. Landlords in Baltimore continue to take advantage of rules stacked in their favor to evict low-income (and frequently minority) tenants; in a particularly egregious example, the Kushner Cos. (as in Trump son-in-law Jared Kushner) has aggressively sought to jail tenants who fall behind on their rent.

As whites moved to the suburbs, sped along the way by massive investments in new highways, water and sewer systems, schools and other public amenities, Baltimore City's infrastructure began to crumble. Neighborhoods like those in the East and West Baltimore portions of Mr. Cummings' district became increasingly isolated from economic and educational opportunities. (Mr. Cummings was among the Baltimore leaders who sought to address that problem through the development of a new light rail line connecting those neighborhoods to employment centers including the Social Security Administration and Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center, but Gov. Larry Hogan, who over the weekend responded to Mr. Trump's tweets by calling Baltimore "the very heart of the state" and on Monday by asking why politicians aren't "focused on solving the problems and getting to work," killed the project.)

Meanwhile, back in the '90s, Democrats and Republicans both discovered that espousing zero-tolerance policing was great politics, so long as it was enforced disproportionately against blacks and Hispanics in the nation's cities and not against whites in suburban and rural communities. Plenty of people share blame for that, including former Vice President Joe Biden and former Maryland Gov. (and former Baltimore mayor) Martin O'Malley. But not a lot of them continue to espouse the notion that locking more people up for minor offenses or stopping and frisking people on the streets are good ideas, as the Trump administration has done.

The Obama administration tried to do something about the pockets of concentrated poverty in American cities (and Baltimore specifically) by using federal housing policy to affirmatively foster desegregation, something the Fair Housing Act had called for 50 years before, but Mr. Trump's HUD secretary, Baltimore's own Ben Carson, has been working to dismantle those efforts.

We will agree with President Trump on one thing, though. We wish Mr. Cummings weren't so focused on investigating the Trump administration. We wish, for example, that immigrant children weren't being held in inhumane conditions at the border, that the White House complied with congressional subpoenas, that administration officials weren't conducting public business on private email accounts or that the president of the United States didn't look on the office as a giant profit center for himself and his family. If not for things like that, Mr. Cummings' role as chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform would probably take up much less of his time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Here is what yesterday's Baltimore Sun editorial states:

President Trump, whose early career was marred by a federal housing discrimination suit, may be interested to know that Baltimore was something of a pioneer in that regard. It enacted the first housing segregation ordinances, which were soon invalidated by the Supreme Court, leading to subtler and more nefarious tactics. Racially restrictive covenants, privately enforced, prevented the sale of homes in certain neighborhoods to minorities. Redlining prevented minorities from getting financing to buy homes in white neighborhoods. And blockbusting made rich the unscrupulous men who capitalized on racism and fear to drive white flight. They profited on blacks who sought security and better opportunities but instead found themselves exploited and impoverished.

They go on to make the point:

Those days aren't nearly so far in the past as we might like to think. Just seven years ago, Baltimore settled a landmark lending discrimination suit against Wells Fargo, which steered minority borrowers into subprime mortgages—the sort of abuse the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which Mr. Trump has eviscerated, might have prevented. Landlords in Baltimore continue to take advantage of rules stacked in their favor to evict low-income (and frequently minority) tenants; in a particularly egregious example, the Kushner Cos. (as in Trump son-in-law Jared Kushner) has aggressively sought to jail tenants who fall behind on their rent.

We do have a legacy of discrimination in Baltimore City to overcome. The President, instead of challenging that legacy, has decided to pile on in the manner he did with his comments.

I know that Baltimore will rise above this. I know the city is resilient, and I know this great city's greatest days are still ahead as we tackle that legacy and move on to the future. But I think we as a body—both Republicans and Democrats alike—have an obligation to also stand up for our country. We cannot allow these kind of remarks out of the Oval Office to go unanswered. We cannot allow silence when the President of the United States challenges the very idea of what it means to be American, which is a place where people of all different backgrounds, all different races, and all different religions can come together: "E pluribus unum." The President wants to drive a stake in that idea. He wants to divide the country, and we cannot be silent while he soils the Oval Office.

I ask all of us to speak out, wherever we are, when we see this kind of attack by the President of the United States. It is wrong for our country. It is bad for our country. It is a disgrace to the Oval Office.

The one thing I can say is that, in the face of that disgrace, Baltimore has shown great dignity, incredible dignity, the dignity of a city of people who see a wonderful future ahead, and we should all work together to make that future as bright as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from today's Baltimore Sun editorial board.

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

[July 30, 2019]

BETTER TO HAVE A FEW RATS THAN TO BE ONE

(By Baltimore Sun Editorial Board)

In case anyone missed it, the president of the United States had some choice words to describe Maryland's 7th congressional district on Saturday morning. Here are the key phrases: "no human being would want to live there," it is a "very dangerous & filthy place," "Worst in the USA" and, our personal favorite: It is a "rat and rodent infested mess." He wasn't really speaking of the 7th as a whole. He failed to mention Ellicott City, for example, or Baldwin or Monkton or Prettyboy, all of which are contained in the sprawling yet oddly-shaped district that runs from western Howard County to southern Harford County. No, Donald Trump's wrath was directed at Baltimore and specifically at Rep. Elijah Cummings, the 68-year-old son of a former South Carolina sharecropper who has represented the district in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1996.

It's not hard to see what's going on here. The congressman has been a thorn in this president's side, and Mr. Trump sees attacking African American members of Congress as good politics, as it both warms the cockles of the white supremacists who love him and causes so many of the thoughtful people who don't to scream. President Trump badmouthed Baltimore in order to make a point that the border camps are "clean, efficient & well run," which, of course, they are not—unless you are fine with all the overcrowding, squalor, cages and deprivation to be found in what the Department of Homeland Security's own inspector-general recently called "a ticking time bomb."

In pointing to the 7th, the president wasn't hoping his supporters would recognize landmarks like Johns Hopkins Hospital, perhaps the nation's leading medical center. He wasn't conjuring images of the U.S. Social Security Administration, where they write the checks that so many retired and disabled Americans depend upon. It wasn't about the beauty of the Inner Harbor or the proud history of Fort McHenry. And it surely wasn't about the economic standing of a district where the median income is actually above the national average. No, he was returning to an old standby of attacking an African American lawmaker from a majority black district on the most emotional and bigoted of arguments. It was only surprising that there wasn't room for a few classic phrases like "you people" or "welfare queens" or "crime-ridden ghettos" or a suggestion that the congressman "go back" to where he came from.

This is a president who will happily debase himself at the slightest provocation. And given Mr. Cummings' criticisms of U.S. border policy, the various investigations he has launched as chairman of the House Oversight Committee, his willingness to call Mr. Trump a racist for his recent attacks on the freshmen congresswomen, and the fact that "Fox & Friends" had recently aired a segment critical of the city, slamming Baltimore must have been irresistible in a Pavlovian way. Fox News rang the bell, the president salivated and his thumbs moved across his cell phone into action.

As heartening as it has been to witness public figures rise to Charm City's defense on Saturday, from native daughter House Speaker Nancy Pelosi to Mayor Bernard C. "Jack" Young, we would above all remind Mr. Trump that the 7th District, Baltimore included, is part of the United States that he is supposedly governing. The White House has far more power to effect change in this city, for good or ill, than any single member of Congress including Mr. Cummings. If there are problems here, rodents included, they are as much his responsibility as anyone's, perhaps more because he holds the most powerful office in the land.

Finally, while we would not sink to name-calling in the Trumpian manner—or ruefully point out that he failed to spell the congressman's name correctly (it's Cummings, not Cumming)—we would tell the most dishonest man to ever occupy the Oval Office, the mocker of war heroes, the gleeful grabber of women's private parts, the serial bankrupter of businesses, the useful idiot of Vladimir Putin and the guy who insisted there are "good people" among murderous neo-Nazis that he's still not fooling most Americans into believing he's even slightly competent in his current post. Or that he possesses a scintilla of integrity. Better to have some vermin living in your neighborhood than to be one.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. With that, I yield to the senior Senator from Maryland, my friend, BEN CARDIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first, I thank Senator VAN HOLLEN, my seatmate and friend representing the State of Maryland in the U.S. Senate. His comments reflect the views, I hope, of the overwhelmingly majority of Americans. It is critically important that we speak out as to what the President has said.

I have lived my entire life in Baltimore. I love Baltimore. It is a great city. As Senator VAN HOLLEN has said,

it has an incredible history. It is a vibrant city. There are so many good things happening there. It has a great future, and it needs our help from the point of view of any major urban center in America.

On weekends, my wife and I will frequently walk areas of Baltimore City in order to get some exercise, to clear our heads from the workweek, and to see what is happening in Baltimore. I must tell you that it is so energizing to see the building cranes in downtown Baltimore building new housing for our young people coming into our city because they know the economic future of Baltimore. They are there because they want to live in an exciting place in Baltimore City.

We see the optimism on their faces as they are doing their exercise in the morning and walking the streets of Baltimore. We see a great city that is continuing to rebuild in a modern economy. So when the President of the United States insults the city of Baltimore and Congressman CUMMINGS, it is incumbent on all of us to speak out and tell the President: This is unacceptable.

We know the Office of the President is frequently referred to as a bully pulpit that he can use, but the President of the United States cannot be a bully. Yet that is exactly what he is doing, trying to bully minorities and others in this country. It will not work.

The bully is not ELIJAH CUMMINGS, as President Trump called him. The bully is President Trump. The person who is dividing our country is President Trump, and he should be the one bringing us together.

Why does he do this? I don't think any of us believe that he isn't doing it for political reasons. He wants to distract from what is happening in this country. In the Congress of the United States, Congressman CUMMINGS is leading a committee that has the responsibility of checks and balances of our system to act as a check on the President of the United States.

Does anybody in this Chamber believe there shouldn't be a check and balance in our system on this President? Look at how he has used his Executive powers and abused his Executive powers and the emergency declarations that he has used.

The Mueller report spells out how the President tried to interfere in the investigation. The way he talks about our judiciary, saying that he is not going to follow the orders of our court, and the way he trashes our free press—all of that cries out for an aggressive check and balance on the independent first branch of government, and that is what ELIJAH CUMMINGS is doing.

So why is the President using these personal attacks against ELIJAH CUMMINGS and the city he represents, Baltimore? To try to distract from the legitimate role Congress plays as a check and balance on the powers of President Trump.

It won't work. I can assure you that Congressman CUMMINGS is going to

continue to do his work. His committee is going to continue to do its work. I am going to continue to do my work as a U.S. Senator, and Senator VAN HOLLEN is going to continue to do what is right to make sure we carry out our constitutional responsibilities.

He also does this, quite frankly, for a political appeal against minority communities. That is inexcusable for any American, but for the President of the United States, it is totally outrageous.

As Senator VAN HOLLEN said, we don't have to defend ELIJAH CUMMINGS. He can defend himself.

I have known ELIJAH CUMMINGS now for about 40 years. When I was speaker of the house of delegates in Annapolis, there was a young, new legislator who came upon the scene—ELIJAH CUMMINGS. I recognized from the beginning that he was going to be a great leader, and he showed that in his very early years. He rose to become speaker pro tempore of our house of delegates, and he was a leading voice as a member of the house of delegates.

You see, we had something in common. Both ELIJAH CUMMINGS and I graduated from the same public high school in Baltimore City, Baltimore City College. By the way, so did DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER and three members of Congress—from the same public high school in Baltimore City. We both attended the same law school, the University of Maryland School of Law.

So I recognized from the beginning that there was a lot in common, and I wanted to help this young legislator. He then, of course, ran for Congress. He was elected to Congress, and he has done an incredible job. He is a gifted orator. He motivates people by his speech. He is a mentor for young people, and he has helped so many young people with their lives.

He lives in Baltimore City in a neighborhood where he is an inspiration to people who otherwise would not have much hope. He has used his own life experiences to lift the lives of others, and, yes, I can tell you the record of so many accomplishments that he has.

Just this past week, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN, we announced a \$125 million grant for the Howard Street tunnel for which Congressman CUMMINGS played a critical role in getting those funds. That is going to mean thousands of jobs for Baltimore and economic opportunity for our region. That is just one example.

In the revitalization of Penn Station, Amtrak is going to invest \$90 million in revitalizing that part of Baltimore. ELIJAH CUMMINGS was instrumental in getting that done.

In the Ellicott City flood—two floods within a 20-month period—it was part of his congressional district. President Trump doesn't quite understand how Congressman CUMMINGS' district is redistricted, but he represents Ellicott City. He was on the scene immediately and helped bring in all of the Federal partners so that Ellicott City could beat the odds.

When you have a major flood like that, most businesses don't return. In Ellicott City, they returned. Why? Because of the Federal partnership in which ELLIJAH CUMMINGS played a critical role, as well as other members of our congressional delegation.

Affordable housing—Congressman CUMMINGS has brought affordable housing to Baltimore.

Public safety—after Freddie Gray, I will never forget the scene I was watching on the television screen. We saw the riots and the disruption that started in Baltimore. There was ELLIJAH CUMMINGS on the streets, calming things down and saving lives. That is what he was doing to represent his community. That is the type of legislator he is.

He has provided support for public safety in Baltimore, for public education in Baltimore, and for STEM education in Baltimore City public schools.

So, President Trump, when you say this guy hasn't done his work to represent the people in the Seventh Congressional District, you are absolutely wrong. Come to Baltimore. Let us show you exactly what we have been able to accomplish and how you can help us, but don't defame our city. You are the President of the United States. Act as President. Bring us together. Recognize that you are responsible for this entire country, and help us with the reputation of Baltimore.

Again, I don't have to defend my city. My city is well known. It is one of the great cities in America, but I am going to do it anyway because I want my colleagues to understand how proud we are of our city, those of us who represent the State of Maryland and represent Baltimore City.

There is the Nation's first Washington Monument, the National Aquarium, Oriole Park, M&T Bank, Fort McHenry. Talk about Enoch Pratt library, one of the great libraries in America that gave free libraries to the people of our city. There is Eubie Blake National Jazz Institute and Cultural Center.

I could go through all the museums we have in Baltimore: the American Visionary Art Museum; the Baltimore Museum of Art; the Baltimore Museum of Industry; Walters Art Gallery; the Jewish Museum of Maryland; Babe Ruth's birthplace—born in Baltimore; the Reginald F. Lewis Museum; and the B&O Railroad Museum. How many of us have been there? The great history of the railroads in Baltimore started there. There is the Maryland Science Center.

There are great sports icons that have come out of Baltimore—from Johnny Unitas to Frank Robinson, to Brooks Robinson, Cal Ripken, and Ray Lewis.

We have great healthcare institutions—Johns Hopkins. I just got an email as I was sitting on the floor. I know the rules of the Senate prohibit me from looking at my electronic de-

vice, but U.S. News & World Report today ranked the Johns Hopkins department of neurology No. 1 in the Nation. It is located in Baltimore City, MD.

We can go over the other great institutions we have, such as the University of Maryland Medical Center, the Kennedy Krieger Institute, and the Lieber Institute for Brain Development.

We have great colleges, from Morgan State University to the University of Maryland School of Law, to Loyola University, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore Coppin State, Notre Dame of Maryland University.

The list goes on and on: farmers markets and public markets; trend-setting writers from John Waters to David Simon, Tom Clancy, and Barry Levinson; the unique neighborhoods from "Lil' Itlee" to Pigtown.

Baltimore is well known. The Taste of Baltimore—how many of you know that the only place you can get a really legitimate crab cake is in Baltimore City? We all know that. And there are Old Bay Seasoning, Berger Cookies, and Goetze's Candies.

There is the Port of Baltimore, the economic heart of our State; Domino Sugar; and Under Armour, which is investing hundreds of millions of dollars into Baltimore City because they know the future.

There are the NGOs that are centered in Baltimore—the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Abell Foundation, Center for Urban Families, Catholic Relief Services, and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services.

I do this in hopes that the President might be listening so that he can learn a little bit about why we are so proud of Baltimore City. What we do ask is very simple. To the President: Come and learn about our urban centers and how you can help us in meeting the problems that we have in Baltimore and many urban cities around the Nation. We need a Federal partner who will help us with our economic growth and help us meet the challenges of the future.

It is exciting to live in Baltimore, and it is exciting to see our city grow. I am proud to be a Baltimorean, and I am proud to represent Baltimore in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator CARDIN, for talking about some of the highlights of Baltimore City and the storied history of Baltimore City. It is a history of much good but also a lot of challenges that I recounted earlier. It doesn't do Baltimore City or any city in this country any good when the person in the highest office in this country launches these nasty, personal, racial diatribes.

I know the President had a history of these kinds of comments before he came to the Oval Office. But now that he is in the Oval Office, all of us have

an obligation and responsibility to speak out when he fouls the office in that way.

If the President really wants to help cities like Baltimore, he can do some of the things Senator CARDIN talked about. On a bipartisan basis in the Appropriations Committee, we are working to make investments that will help that city and many other cities with things like the CDBG—community development block grants—things like economic development administration proposals, things like financing through CDFIs, and things like minority business enterprises. Those are four investments. They don't solve the problems, but they certainly help.

Here is the thing. In President Trump's budget, zero—he zeroed out every single one of those programs.

I propose a major additional investment in our schools throughout this country, including title I schools, which are schools in lower income areas. That would be a huge boost to education throughout the country and to the city of Baltimore.

As Senator CARDIN said, we need to make investments in our national infrastructure. We have a great, thriving port in Baltimore with good-paying jobs, so we need to expand it.

There are so many things we can and should be doing, but the President, apparently, according to many, has this political strategy where he doesn't want to talk about those things. It is a political strategy that seeks to divide this country, not to unite this country. If you think about that, that is a pretty sick political strategy. It is sick for the country, sick for Maryland, and sick for Baltimore.

So I hope all of us will work to focus on the things we can do to make Baltimore and Maryland and this country stronger and end this kind of divisive rhetoric. Part of ending it means speaking out against it when we see it. We need everybody in this body to join us in doing it.

Again, I think when it comes to the city of Baltimore, it is going to rise way above the President's comments. It understands it has challenges, but it also understands it has a great future. Let us—all together—be part of a great future for Baltimore and this country, and that means coming together to serve the interests of all of our constituents.

I thank the Senate for the time Senator CARDIN and I have had here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the need to fix our broken budget and spending process.

Picking up efforts we began in the 114th Congress, the Senate Budget Committee has spent the last several months holding hearings and meetings with Members of Congress, State officials, the administration, and stakeholder groups to listen to their budget

reform priorities. Along the way, we have collected a lot of good ideas.

Today, I come to the floor to outline the fiscal reform plan that incorporates a lot of the feedback we received. It reflects suggestions from Members on both sides of the aisle and from groups that span the political spectrum. These reforms are not driven by politics but, instead, are rooted in fixing our broken budget and spending process in favor of a system that works for everyone.

In developing this plan, my focus was on creating a durable system to substantially manage our country's finances, to improve transparency, to improve oversight, to improve accountability in the budget process, and to end the brinksmanship in our fiscal debates.

I have broken the plan down into four separate discussion drafts, which I am sharing this week with Senate Budget Committee members. Each of the drafts tackles a different aspect of the broken budget and spending process.

The first proposal is the most ambitious. It would reorient the budget process around long-term planning and shift the Federal Government to a biennial budgeting and spending system. There are 20 States, including my home State of Wyoming, that have some form of biennial budgeting and appropriations. I have long believed that one of the most important reforms we could do at the Federal level would be to move to a biennial process to have the problem only every other year.

The plan proposes to maintain the budget resolution as a concurrent resolution but with a few important changes.

First, it would change how we write the budget. Topline discretionary figures would be clearly stated in the resolution, while mandatory spending would continue to be displayed on a portfolio basis. This new approach will allow each individual Member to have more of a say in the budget through the amendment process.

Second, it would require the budget resolution to include debt-to-GDP targets to focus Congress on creating a path to stabilize our debt levels and sustainably manage our finances. It could even provide an estimate of anticipated revenues.

Third, the plan would allow for, upon adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the automatic enrollment of a bill that would set discretionary spending caps—something that has taken until right now to get done this year—enforced by both Congress and OMB and increase the debt limit in line with the levels assumed in the resolution. It saves a lot of time.

The proposal seeks to encourage Congress and the President to reach agreement on a fiscal framework early in the budget process while maintaining the budget resolution as a congressional document. The budget resolution would be enforced whether or not

the President signs the joint resolution.

To encourage Congress to adhere to its budget blueprint, the proposal would create a special reconciliation process that would be triggered if the Congressional Budget Office finds that Congress is not on a path toward meeting the budget resolution's fiscal target that everybody voted on. This process would allow Congress to make surgical changes to achieve the debt target and could only be used for deficit reduction. The Byrd rule, which prohibits changes to Social Security in reconciliation, would apply.

The plan also seeks to get legislative committees more involved in the budget process. It would require them, at the beginning of the process, to share their plans to address spending on unauthorized programs in their jurisdiction, as well as programs that Agency-based inspectors general and the Government Accountability Office have identified as "in need of improvement." For that budget cycle, the committee would have to suggest a dollar amount for those programs listed as "such sums."

It would change our committee's name to the Fiscal Control Committee to better reflect the committee's focus on setting spending and revenue guardrails. It would also require the chairs and ranking members of the Appropriations and Finance Committees, if not already members of the Fiscal Control Committee, to serve as nonvoting members of the committee. This change is intended to increase the input in the primary spending and taxing committees in developing fiscal plans.

The second discussion draft I am releasing deals with congressional budget enforcement. Justice Louis Brandeis once wrote that "sunlight is said to be the best disinfectant." In keeping with this principle, the proposal would require reports tracking Congress's adherence to its budget plan to be regularly printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and posted on a publicly accessible website. This would help ensure that Members of Congress and the leadership of each committee are accountable for their fiscal decisions.

The other two components of this draft deal with Senate budget points of order, which are the means through which the body enforces congressional budgets and rules. These points of order are supposed to create a meaningful obstacle to breaching the budget, but in recent years they have been routinely ignored or waived.

The discussion draft proposes to make it harder to rewrite "inconvenient" budget rules. There have been a number of attempts in recent years to rewrite budget rules outside of the normal budget process to allow for more spending. There is already a point of order against this practice under the Congressional Budget Act, but that point of order lies against the whole measure, making it a very blunt in-

strument. The discussion draft would make the current point of order surgical so it would target only the offending provision without threatening to shut down the whole bill.

In a similar vein, the discussion draft would disallow global waivers for surgical points of order. Right now, any Senator can make a single motion to waive all budget points of order that lie against a measure. These global waivers allow numerous budget rules to be broken with one vote, regardless of whether the points of order that lie are surgical or apply to the whole measure. These waivers have even been used to preemptively prevent surgical points of order that could alter the bill text from being raised. The discussion draft aims to end that practice and ensure the ability of Senators to raise points of order that could remedy a budget violation without killing the bill.

The third discussion draft I am releasing deals with Congressional Budget Office operations and transparency. The CBO serves a vital role in the budget and legislative processes. While the Agency's longstanding mission has been to produce timely, objective, and accurate information for Congress, there have been growing calls for increased transparency in the estimating process. The discussion draft aims to build on bipartisan transparency reforms already underway at the CBO in a number of ways.

No. 1, it would require CBO to report on its transparency initiatives, review past estimates to see where the Agency got it right or got it wrong, and produce underlying data for its estimates of major legislation.

No. 2, it would require interest costs to be included as supplemental information in cost estimates, ensuring that lawmakers and the public have better information about the true costs of legislation.

No. 3, it would require public cost estimates of appropriations legislation. Unlike legislation reported from authorizing committees, there is not currently a requirement for CBO to provide public estimates of legislation reported by the Appropriations Committee.

No. 4, it would require CBO and the Government Accountability Office to conduct ongoing portfolio reviews of Federal programs to help lawmakers identify spending on duplicative, overlapping, and fragmented programs, as well as long-term funding trends and liabilities.

That was my third discussion draft.

My fourth discussion draft relates to how budget resolutions are considered on the Senate floor. The Congressional Budget Act provides special expedited procedures for consideration of a budget resolution on the Senate floor. These procedures were meant to ensure that the budget is considered and adopted in a deliberate but efficient manner. However, arcane floor procedures and a quirk of the act have undermined this intent by allowing a

marathon of votes known as a vote-arama. Once debate on the budget has ended, we have a vote-arama. Without time for debate or analysis of what is being proposed, this process is not conducive to substantive consideration of fiscal policy and serves as a major deterrent to considering a budget on the floor. The discussion draft aims to establish a more orderly process for Senate consideration of the budget resolution that ensures the ability of Senators from both sides of the aisle to offer and have votes on amendments.

It would change the current 50-hour rule on debate of a budget resolution to a limit on consideration and force the Senate to consider amendments after all allotted general debate time expires. Amendments would alternate between those offered by the minority and those offered by the majority, and the maximum debate time on the first-degree amendments would be reduced from 2 hours to 1 hour, to allow for the consideration of more amendments.

Under this proposal, even if the maximum debate time was burned on each amendment, 24 amendments could be considered. Coincidentally, 24 is both the average and the median number of rollcall votes on budget resolutions since 1976. Of course, it isn't 1 minute of debate. It would be an hour of debate.

This proposal would apply only to the Senate consideration of budget resolutions. It would not preclude adoption of a managers' package, apply to reconciliation bills, or change House procedures.

We can all agree that the current budget and spending system has broken down. Reforming this dysfunctional system has been a goal of mine since entering the Senate and is one of my top priorities before I leave this body at the end of this Congress.

I encourage my colleagues to consider the reform ideas I have laid out today and invite their feedback. I am hopeful that through this process, we will be able to reach bipartisan agreement to end the current dysfunction and put our country back toward a sustainable fiscal future—and on time so we will not have government shutdowns.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

AMERICA'S TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, yesterday I joined the fellow leaders of the Environment and Public Works Committee to introduce America's Transportation Infrastructure Act, a 5-year reauthorization bill that would deliver resources to repair and maintain critical surface transportation infrastructure.

Today the committee approved our comprehensive legislation with a strong bipartisan vote of 21 to 0 this morning.

As the chair of the EPW's Transportation and Infrastructure Sub-

committee, I am incredibly proud of this legislation, which is the result of months of serious negotiations with the full committee chairman, Senator BARRASSO, and Ranking Member CARPER, my subcommittee, and my ranking member, Senator CARDIN of Maryland.

It was not always easy, but I think we have produced a bill that achieves our priorities and secures needed investments in our Nation's infrastructure. First and foremost, the bill provides additional funding for highway investment. How many times do we hear: We don't have enough money to complete this. We can't get it done.

This also maintains the States' shares through formula dollars. That means a rising tide lifts all boats, whether a State is urban or rural, like my home State of West Virginia.

The majority of these funds—90 percent—are distributed by the formula to the States, providing maximum flexibility to our State programs, and with a full 5-year reauthorization, State DOTs will have the certainty they need to plan their investments without fear of lapses in their contracting authority. After all, it is the States, not the bureaucrats in Washington, that know their communities' needs the best.

Our legislation would get rid of some of the obstacles the States face as they work to start and finalize infrastructure plans. They take forever, and they cost so much. The bill incorporates the Trump administration's focus on One Federal Decision. Under that policy, the U.S. Department of Transportation is in charge of leading the regulatory review process—One Federal Decision—and it would consolidate the review of other Federal agencies like the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, and others who weigh in on these projects. That means the States will not end up in a regulatory purgatory, going back and forth from agency to agency seeking endless approvals.

DOT would also maintain a Federal dashboard system so the States can see where they stand in the process.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act directs the Department of Transportation to work to complete its review process within 2 years and to push other agencies to expedite their regulatory reviews. Everything drags on so much, and it makes it so long and expensive. This would push our agencies to expedite their regulatory reviews under its own categorical exclusions. That is a fancy term for when the Department doesn't think a full, costly, and time-consuming permitting process is necessary for a straightforward infrastructure project such as replacing a bridge from right where it is and putting a new bridge right where it is. It takes forever. So we would eliminate that.

We also worked in a bipartisan way to promote natural infrastructure that will help reduce costs and timelines, diminish environmental impacts, and improve the resiliency of our infra-

structure to natural disasters such as floods that are so common in my part of the country.

West Virginia has the unfortunate title of being in the top five States of structurally deficient bridges. That is why I am very proud that America's Transportation and Infrastructure Act includes language I cosponsored with Senator BROWN implementing the new Bridge Investment Program.

This program will infuse \$6 billion over 5 years in additional funding to fix bridges in poor condition—dedicated funding that is essential to addressing this problem.

When faced with the decision on using scarce taxpayer dollars on a new highway expansion or improving bridge safety, too often—it is too tempting—States opt for the appeal of a ribbon-cutting on a new stretch of highway. Now, hopefully, they won't have to make that choice and we can reduce both congestion and the odds of a bridge failure—something that not only threatens our lives but also cuts off a community while they wait for a costly replacement.

The climate and resilience portion of America's Transportation Infrastructure Act will reduce emissions from the transportation sector and ensure that the taxpayers are not repeatedly replacing infrastructure affected by natural disasters.

This portion of the bill also includes important bipartisan legislation that I cosponsored. The first is called the USE IT Act. This would facilitate the deployment of carbon capture, utilization, and storage technologies by reducing regulatory obligations that the project stakeholders would face. It also includes the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, which will provide funding to States and communities to replace older, smog-producing vehicles—like obsolete schoolbuses—with modern vehicles that use diesel, propane, natural gas, and electricity.

Most importantly for West Virginia and for broader Appalachia, this legislation includes several provisions, which I wrote, to accelerate the completion of the Appalachian Development Highway System and reauthorize the economic development activities of the Appalachian Regional Commission. The commission was first authorized in 1965. The Appalachian Development Highway System was designed to better integrate our region with the Midwest, Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and South. For an economically-distressed area with communities that are relatively isolated, this infrastructure network is vital. It is vital for attracting investment, creating new economic opportunities, and improving quality of life.

The Appalachian Regional Commission has found that the highway system has already created and supported more than 168,000 jobs and generated \$7.8 billion in wage income that otherwise would not have existed. Those wages, in turn, drive local and Federal

tax bases. Completing this system would generate an additional \$8.7 billion in annual economic activity. It would support another 46,000 jobs and lead to an additional \$2.7 billion in worker income. These are very significant numbers. I can't really overstate the impact this additional economic activity would have in our region.

Unfortunately, the Appalachian Development Highway System is only 90 percent complete. The remaining 10 percent generally represents the most challenging mountain terrain, and that means these are the costliest and most environmentally complicated miles to complete. We have to get this done.

The highway system was started almost 55 years ago. America is better than letting an infrastructure priority just sit around for more than half a century with no end in sight due to lack of funding or regulatory uncertainty. This was also a promise made to the people of Appalachia.

The Appalachian Development Highway System completion was identified as being in our national interest in the last two highway bills. But it is America's Transportation Infrastructure Act that will actually provide a mechanism to move us toward the finish line.

Beyond the regulatory reforms I just spoke about, my language allows States that for whatever reason have accrued significant Appalachian Development Highway System balances to exchange those dollars with States like West Virginia that are still working to complete projects, like our Corridor H. But we lack the resources to engineer and construct these challenging remaining miles. In return, those States that turn their dollars back in to the Appalachian Development Highway System will receive dollars that they could use for any project in their State that would otherwise be eligible as a Federal highway project. That means that States can respond to the changing transportation needs in their particular area. They use excess dollars from an undersubscribed Federal loan program, which has historically not contributed to infrastructure investment in rural America.

This would be a win for all States involved. Those needing additional funding will be able to continue to advance the Appalachian Development Highway System, and States that have needed to shift their focus—say on growing urban transportation needs—will have the added flexibility to be able to do that.

I appreciate my fellow Appalachian Development Highway System State committee colleagues for working with me to include this provision, as well as Leader MCCONNELL's support on this section of the bill and our counterpart legislation, the Advancing Infrastructure Development in Appalachia Act.

The committee also included language that I wrote and worked with those individuals on to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Commission—a key economic development agency—at

\$180 million a year. My provision also doubles to \$20 million the funding available for something that I care deeply about, and that is broadband deployment in Appalachia, which is a critical tool for connecting our communities and making and keeping our region more competitive.

I thank Leader MCCONNELL and Ranking Member CARDIN and Senator WICKER for their support of this language and the stand-alone ARC authorization bill.

Leader MCCONNELL also joined me in authorizing the ARC to provide up to \$5 million in grants to support the development of a central Appalachian natural gas liquids storage hub, along with the associated downstream manufacturing sector for it. This infrastructure project would be huge for the economies of West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. In fact, the American Chemistry Council estimates that this regional market and downstream manufacturing would generate \$36 billion in capital investment and more than 100,000 jobs. It would also help keep a much larger share of the economic value and employment opportunity in our States where the resources are, compared to just producing and then exporting the gas and associated natural gas liquids to other parts of the country or abroad.

Secretary Perry and the Department of Energy have also endorsed the concept of this project, as well as the significant economic and energy security dividends that it would pay for Appalachia and the entire United States.

This is somewhat of a modest investment given the significant private sector capital needed to build this out, but it is essential that the Federal Government send clear messages to potential investors that it supports this driver of economic growth in an area that would greatly benefit.

This legislation gives the ARC the power to lead the way.

Investment in our country's infrastructure is vital to the many aspects of our American life, from keeping us competitive in the global economy and keeping our drivers safe—there are a lot of safety aspects in this bill—to reducing irritating congestion and minimizing impacts to the economy.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act delivers on all these fronts and ensures that rural America will benefit equally from these investments. Not only will our legislation help rebuild and repair our infrastructure system, but it will also help us create new infrastructure opportunities for generations to come.

I appreciate my colleagues' collaboration. My colleague from Rhode Island is on the floor. He was on the committee this morning when we both voted in favor of this legislation. It is a bipartisan bill working to make sure that this country sees a 5-year highway reauthorization and all the benefits it would provide.

I think all my Senate colleagues will find a lot to like in this legislation. I

am hoping we get it on the floor in the fall. I encourage their support when it comes time for a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for her work on the highway bill that we voted out of the Environment and Public Works Committee today and on our industrial emissions bill and on carbon capture. It has been a terrific working relationship.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KIM BINSTED AND DR. RYAN EDWARDS

Madam President, as I begin my 251st "Time to Wake Up" remarks, I would like to thank two AAAS fellows who will be shortly leaving my office.

Dr. Kim Binsted came to us from the University of Hawaii, where she was principal investigator on the NASA-sponsored Hi-Seas project, studying conditions like those that astronauts would encounter on Mars. Next month, she returns to Hawaii to continue her research.

Dr. Ryan Edwards joined us after completing his Ph.D. at Princeton University, where he studied carbon capture and storage. He hails from Australia and is thus by far the best cricket player on my staff—low bar. Next up for him will be Houston and more carbon capture research.

I thank both of them for their service and their expertise, and I wish them the best.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, tomorrow, about 2½ miles from here, executives from some of the biggest fossil fuel companies in the world will be meeting at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is a power-packed event. The chamber is the most powerful lobbying force here in Washington and a fierce political operator. The fossil fuel industry runs remorseless and often covert political operations. They are defending a \$650 billion annual subsidy, as the International Monetary Fund estimates, so hundreds of millions spent on lobbying and election mischief is money well spent: The Chamber and Big Oil together have stopped climate progress here.

For the member companies of the chamber, including companies that say they support climate action, it is time to confront the relationship between the chamber and the fossil fuel industry. The Earth is spinning toward climate catastrophe. Action in Congress to limit carbon pollution is essential to averting this catastrophe. Yet the chamber, according to the watchdog InfluenceMap, is in a virtual tie as the most obstructive group on climate change, blocking legislation, opposing Executive action, and even seeking to undermine climate science. The chamber is so obstructive, it would be better called the Chamber of Carbon.

The chamber has opposed one comprehensive climate bill after another—

first, the bipartisan cap-and-trade bill in 2005, the Energy Policy Act. The chamber helped defeat it with a Key Vote Alert—a signal that whoever voted in favor of the bill could face an onslaught of Chamber political attacks in the next election.

In 2007, the chamber ran political TV ads against climate legislation, claiming that it would prevent people from heating their homes or that they wouldn't be able to drive to work any longer. Here is somebody cooking an egg over candles.

In 2009, the chamber led the charge against the Waxman-Markey bill. For that legislation, the chamber pulled out all the stops—haranguing Members, more “vote alerts” and “how they voted” scorecards, sending more messages of election doom if they dared to support Waxman-Markey. Since the U.S. Chamber tanked Waxman-Markey, Republicans in Congress have refused to hold hearings on, mark up, debate, or vote on any legislation proposing a policy framework for economy-wide reductions in carbon pollution.

It is not just in Congress that the chamber wields its baleful influence; the chamber also fought climate action in the courts and at the executive branch. In fact, in 2010, the chamber sued the EPA to overturn the finding that greenhouse gas emissions endanger public health and welfare. You would think it would be obvious that they do. Look around, and you will see that they do. Disabling the endangerment finding would cripple the Agency's ability to regulate carbon pollution under the Clean Air Act, so off went the chamber.

When the courts rejected this lawsuit on the endangerment finding, then the chamber became central command for corporate lawyers, coal lobbyists, and Republican political strategists to devise legal schemes to fight climate regulations. This produced another chamber lawsuit to block the Clean Power Plan reducing carbon pollution from powerplants.

Of course, once President Trump took office, the chamber went from defense to offense and attacked many Obama administration rules limiting carbon pollution. The chamber even funded the phony report the Trump administration used to justify leaving the Paris accord.

Perhaps, worst of all, the Chamber has fought against science itself. It has proposed putting the evidence—the scientific evidence—of climate change on trial in what its own officials have branded the “Scopes monkey trial of the 21st century.” That is what this crowd was for. Indeed, the Chamber has said the trial “would be evolution versus creationism.” Guess what side it would be on.

This is not your hometown Chamber, folks.

The Chamber has even tried to limit the scientific studies that regulators could consider. The Chamber's evident target was public health studies that

demonstrate just how dangerous burning fossil fuels is to public health. The Chamber is an electioneering force, not just a lobbying force, and it spends massive sums in politics to shore up its control in Congress. Since the 2010 Citizens United decision has allowed outside groups to spend unlimited sums on electioneering activities, the Chamber has funneled, roughly, \$150 million into congressional races, which has made the Chamber the largest distributor of undisclosed donations—dark money, we call it—in congressional races.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Presiding Officer. I appreciate that courtesy.

Blocking action on climate has been the central focus of the Chamber's campaign spending. It ran this ad in Pennsylvania in 2016. Two moms watch their children on a playground. One comments on how much energy the children have. The other says: Oh, don't say that. The candidate wants to tax that energy. The ad gets even weirder when a faceless woman arrives in a car and steps out toward the children. Alarmed, one of the mothers yells the ad's punch line: “Run, Jimmy. Run.” Classy stuff. I wonder who the Chamber was fronting for.

So how does the Chamber's anti-climate crusade square with its big corporate members?

It has members like Coke and Pepsi, which have good internal climate policies and websites that are full of commitments to reduce corporate carbon footprints, and they have signed letters on climate action.

Pepsi signed the Ceres BICEP Climate Declaration. Coke plans to reduce CO₂ emissions by 25 percent. It says it “will work to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions across its value chain, making comprehensive carbon footprint reductions across its manufacturing processes, packaging formats, delivery fleet, refrigeration equipment and ingredient sourcing.”

Yet both Coke and Pepsi fund the Chamber of Commerce, and they fund the American Beverage Association, which, in turn, runs more money to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The end result? Two companies that are actively reducing their carbon emissions and that enthusiastically support good climate policy have the position in Congress, via their funding of the Chamber, of opposing climate action here in Washington—the place where it really counts.

Verizon has reduced its carbon intensity by 28 percent since 2016, and its CEO has publicly stated Verizon's commitment to combat climate change. Yet Verizon, too, funds the Chamber's obstruction.

Then there is Google with its motto: “Don't be evil.” Google is warning its investors that climate change threatens its systems. It says that it is vulnerable to damage or interruption from natural disasters and to the effects of climate change, such as sea level rise, drought, flooding, wildfires, and increased storm severity. Google has signed pledges to fight climate change; yet Google, too, funds the Chamber's anti-climate crusade.

Coke, Pepsi, Verizon, and Google are just four examples among many. These companies say they support climate action but fund one of climate action's worst opponents.

Why does the Chamber put these members in this position? The best explanation I have is that the fossil fuel industry is secretly calling the shots at the Chamber; that is, it is secretly funding the Chamber. That would explain the Chamber's refusal to disclose its funders.

I think this is a governance issue now for these companies, particularly for those members who serve on the Chamber's board. Board members of nonprofit organizations have a common law duty of care. Not knowing who is funding your organization looks like a breach of that duty of care.

The Chamber's member companies need to ask themselves: Do we know who is funding the Chamber? Do we know how much each donor is giving? Do those donations explain the Chamber's years of obstruction?

The Chamber holds itself out as a business association. Another question: Why is it accepting money from non-businesses?

In 2012 and 2014, the Chamber took at least \$5.5 million from front groups that have been backed by the Koch brothers. In 2014, it took \$5.25 million from a front group that was affiliated with Karl Rove.

Did the Chamber's board members know this? Did they exercise the proper duty of care? Do they know what nonbusiness money is funding the Chamber these days? Do they know what percentage of the Chamber's funding comes secretly from fossil fuel interests?

I don't think the Chamber's board members know the answers to any of these questions.

Here is a question for the general counsel of these board member corporations: Should they know or are you going to go with willful ignorance? Good luck with that.

The bottom line is simple. Chamber board members with good climate policies are supporting one of the worst climate obstructors in America. Indeed, they are writing big checks to do so. This, I believe, is not just a moral problem but a governance problem. If these companies aren't asking these tough questions and if they are not pushing the Chamber to be transparent about its funding sources, they are answerable. Until this mess gets sorted out, in spite of all of corporate America's efforts to reduce emissions, its

funding of the “U.S. Chamber of Carbon” means that corporate America is doing more harm than good for our climate.

Again, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his courtesy in allowing me the extra time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, despite what some people might think, I have the highest regard for the Senator from Rhode Island.

It is very interesting in that the climate is changing, and the climate has always changed. All evidence out there—all historical evidence, all scriptural evidence—tells us over and over again that the climate is changing. It always has been changing, and it always will change.

The good news is that the world is not coming to an end because of climate change. That is because the climate is always changing. So, for those people who believe the world is coming to an end because of greenhouse gas emissions, the good news is it is not. I am happy to share that good news with you.

BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019

Madam President, I am here to speak about some other good news, which is that we have an opportunity with a vote that is coming up. Some people call it the budget vote or the budget agreement. I don't refer to it as such. I call it a defense agreement. I think everybody knows where I stand on this. This is a vote that is going to have to come up before too long, and there is a unique group of people in the U.S. Senate who know the reason that we have to pass the defense budget. They are the members of the Senate's Committee on Armed Services. It happens that I chair that committee and that we have done really great work.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we had a situation in which we went through an 8-year period of time when our military was somewhat devastated, and I want to share some of the specifics of that because it is a serious thing. We are going to be voting on the defense budget agreement, and I have already stated where I stand on it. I am here to outline why the budget agreement is necessary for our national defense.

This defense budget agreement will be able to focus on the Senate's Armed Services' top priorities, one of which is to fix the on-base privatization of military housing.

Remember that this happened about 6 months ago. We discovered, all of a sudden, that we were not doing a good job on our privatized housing. Hey, I have to admit that I am partly responsible for that because I was around here when we decided to privatize the

housing. It did work for a while. I think, after a period of time, people got a little careless, and there was a little slack. Some of the contractors who made that commitment got a little bit greedy. This information as to how bad the conditions were came from a person at Tinker Air Force Base who was the spouse of a military person. When I first heard this, I thought there were bad conditions just in my State of Oklahoma, but there were not; they were all over the Nation.

So we fixed that thing. We fixed it with our defense authorization bill, and we had a lot of provisions in there. We are now modernizing our military housing in a way that is going to be good for all of our spouses and others who are forced to live there. For some reason, if our defense budget agreement were to go down in flames and not be passed, there wouldn't be the modernizing of our military or the giving to our troops a well-deserved pay raise, and they have not had a pay raise in a long time. This is going to be the largest pay raise for our military people in the last 10 years. It is a good thing.

By the way, people are always talking about how we can be so concerned about building our military when we have China and Russia that have passed us up in many areas and spend just a fraction of the amount. The reason is very simple, which is that China and Russia are countries that don't have to do anything for their soldiers. We take care of ours. We try to provide good housing. We provide the types of things that our all-volunteer force can be very proud of and are very proud of. That is something we have to incur. The largest single expenditure that we have in the military is end strength—the people out there. Communist countries—China, Russia—don't have to worry about that. “Here is a gun. Go out and kill somebody.” We don't have that luxury, and we wouldn't do that if we wanted to.

If we don't pass this budget bill, the effects on the military will be devastating. Let me just share a couple of things that would happen.

We would force the Department of Defense to operate under a continuing resolution, which would shortchange our troops and waste taxpayer dollars. We all know that. We would face destructive, haphazard cuts in sequestration. What is it we hear on our committee? The Presiding Officer is fully familiar, for she is one of the most loyal members of the Senate's Committee on Armed Services. We have posture hearings for about 6 months at the beginning of every year with the leaders of the various branches of the military—General Votel, Gen. Thomas Waldhauser, ADM Craig Faller, ADM Phil Davidson, all of these people.

What do they tell us?

They tell us, if we don't actually start funding our military again, we are going to have sequestration. Look, if we vote for this thing and pass it, we

will end the sequestration problems and threats forever. It will not happen again.

What else do they tell us?

They tell us that a CR, which is a continuing resolution, would be an absolute disaster. A lot of people in this body don't know this, but every member of the Senate's Committee on Armed Services does know this because they were there.

All of these people—16 leaders—come in for posture hearings each year, and we know the problems we are having and the problems we are confronted with. We would be faced with cuts in sequestration.

This document right here is the “Assessment and Recommendations of the National Defense Strategy Commission.” Here it is right here. This is our blueprint of what we are doing to save America and to put us back on top in all of these areas in which we are deficient. If, for some reason, we don't pass this defense budget agreement, then we will not be able to continue the implementation of the national defense strategy, and we all know that. Certainly, we don't all know that, but the members of the Senate's Committee on Armed Services do know that.

So that is what would happen. But what would this mean? The members of the Armed Services Committee know what it means, but for everybody else, the deficit budget deal would end the threat of sequestration forever. You don't need me to tell you that sequestration would be devastating.

General Milley, just confirmed to be the Chairman of the Joints Chief of Staff, said that the levels of funding caused by sequestration would place America “at great risk.”

Remember, unfortunately, Heather Wilson, the former Air Force Secretary who had to leave her position. She said the cuts would be “absolutely devastating in scope and scale.”

If we were hit by sequestration, there would be an across-the-board cut of \$71 billion to the defense programs. That would halt our progress on the Space Command and developing crucial capabilities like hypersonic weapons and artificial intelligence. Those are two areas where we have actually been passed up by both Russia and China.

Just yesterday, the DARPA announced that they have completed a successful design review of a hypersonic weapons program. Now, that is a good first step. I am really glad because we were way ahead of them back before the last administration came into office, and then, all of a sudden, over that period of time, we got behind. So, meanwhile, China and Russia are already testing their hypersonic weapons, and they are ahead of us. We are just trying to catch up, and that is what this budget vote is all about.

The 2020 NDAA invests in hypersonic weapons, but we can't move forward if we are hit by sequestration. It would mean it would set us even further behind.

By the way, the hypersonics that we are talking about are the state of the art. That is a new thing. That is a weaponry that moves at five times the speed of sound, and here we are, allowing our—I don't want to characterize China and Russia as enemies. They are not enemies, but they are certainly on the other side, and people are in shock when they find out that they have something that we don't have. We have to be competitive with them, and we are going to be if we pass this defense budget vote that we are going to have before us.

So another example, in our NDAA that we passed overwhelmingly just last month, it authorized a 3.1-percent pay raise, or increase, for our troops. They deserve that pay raise, and under sequestration that pay raise is at risk.

The ability for basing facilities to receive the next generation of aircraft is also at risk. If your State is like my State, your State is slated to house the F-35 or the T-X trainer or the KC-46. The KC-46 is a system that is going to replace the KC-135, which has been in place now for over 50 years and so is 50 years old. That is a system, and if you were going to have one of these systems in your State, you may not get it because of this deal. Without the budget vote that is going to take place, we wouldn't be able to move forward with our plan, and we would be hit by sequestration. It could all be over.

I am talking about systems like the F-35, which we talk about every day, and the T-X trainer. We have had the trainers in existence now for some 50 years, and the KC-46, the same thing.

So, anyway, that is what would happen if for some reason we vote against and don't pass the defense bill that we are going to be asked to vote on probably tomorrow.

We have also made plans to continue increasing our end strength by 17,000 troops from the Obama era to our current goal, and without this defense budget deal, that wouldn't be possible. I think we all know it.

Now, maybe we don't all know it in this Chamber, but as for every member of the defense authorization committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, they all know because they have been told over and over, and that is why it is so important that they be very responsible in their vote.

It would be kind of hard to say that you are working for the defense of our Nation and then turn around and vote to gut their funding.

Now, we have made remarkable gains in readiness over the past couple of years, thanks to President Trump's leadership and greater budgetary stability. For just one example, at the end of the Obama administration, only 5 percent of our brigade combat teams were ready to what they call "fight tonight"—only 5 percent.

Now, we have made a huge improvement. That is up to 50 percent now after just 2 years of this administration, but we have a lot more to do. All

the improvements we have made in fiscal years 2018 and 2019 would be at risk if we were not able to go forward and pass our defense budget act that we are going to be asked to support.

Sequestration would undo what we have done and take us back where we were before. It would be abandoning our troops right when we said we would be there for them. A continuing resolution means funding will go to the wrong places—places that were important last year but don't need to be funded this year. That is just wasteful. We all understand that, but a continuing resolution would be especially devastating for the military.

Every one of these military people whom I was just reading about came in for their annual meeting. They all said the same thing: It would be devastating if we had to go into a continuing resolution. We would be forced to do programs that otherwise we would not be doing.

So General Dunford said it himself. He said: "The fact that we have routinely not had a budget at the beginning of the year has delayed new starts, and it's been incredibly inefficient in how we prioritize and allocate resources throughout the year." That was General Dunford.

A continuing resolution means that our military will lose key planning ability. David Norquist, nominated to be the Deputy Secretary of Defense, gave a great example to the Senate Armed Services Committee last week. He said: Let's say a unit is planning right now for some training in October, but we are operating under a continuing resolution. At that time, they will cancel training because they don't know how much money they would be getting in order to accomplish that. We may eventually get more money, but in the meantime we will have lost a month in the process.

With sequestration off the table and with a stable 2-year budget deal in place, the Department of Defense can move forward with what is really important: implementing the National Defense Strategy. This is what my committee has been focusing on all year. We are facing a different, more dangerous world than we were 10 years ago.

I look back wistfully. I have said this many times. I look back wistfully at the days of the Cold War. We had two super powers. We knew what they had, and they knew what we had—mutually assured destruction. It doesn't mean anything anymore. You have countries that are run by people that are mentally deficient having the capability of blowing up one of our American cities. It is a scary world out there. That is what we are doing. That is why it is so important that we pass this budget, because our defense is depending on it.

Not everybody knows this, but the members of the Armed Services Committee do know it. We are falling behind China and Russia as they continue to build their militaries. We are seeing

persistent threats from North Korea, from Iran, from the terrorist groups, and we no longer have the best of everything, and most people don't understand that. Of course the members of our committee do understand that.

We have set clear priorities, and now we need to fund it. The future of our Nation is at stake. This is what it will take to regain the qualitative and quantitative advantages that we have lost.

I would have liked to have seen even more funding provided to this. The National Defense Strategy Commission—by the way, they set up a system that they can use, and that system is that we should be putting together between a 3- and a 5-percent increase over inflation, but we have not done it. We have not done it even with the budget that we are working on now.

The National Defense Strategy Commission, which is nonpartisan, has said that 3 to 5 percent growth is what is needed, and that is what we did not do.

But at the end of the day, I am willing to take this smaller than ideal increase and give our military what it needs—predictability. It is also more than what the House passed in their Defense authorization bill, which was dangerously low.

Every member of Armed Services Committee should vote for this defense budget because they know everything we have been talking about. They know that we are outranged and outgunned in artillery. They know that we are at a disadvantage in air defense, having only two Active-Duty battalions. Nuclear Triad modernization has not been taking place. We aren't there. China and Russia are.

So, anyway, what I am trying to impress upon you is that those individuals who are members of the committee are fully aware of the problems we have had. They remember that under the Obama administration, at the end of the Obama administration, our Air Force was short 2,000 pilots, and 1,500 of them were fighter pilots. Only one-third of our brigade combat teams, one-fourth of our aviation brigades, and half of our divisions were ready. Also, 60 percent of our F-18s weren't flyable. This is what we are in the process of correcting, and it is all dependent upon the passage of this budget.

So I would say to those individuals who are on the committee, I can't imagine that any of them would not be supporting this defense budget when it comes up, and I would hope that we don't have members of our committee who are anticipating doing things such as hearings back in their State or amendments to go as we put our Defense authorization bill through the next steps, because now is when our defense system needs to have this budget passed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to inform my colleagues and the American people about some progress that has been made on a very important bipartisan piece of legislation, plus what a couple other committees are doing along the same line of keeping healthcare costs down—that we are making progress to reduce the price of prescription medicine for the American people.

I have been tilling the fields of legislative policy long enough to know that we have our work cut out for us. The ranking member and I of the Finance Committee started out 6 months ago to cultivate a bipartisan consensus for much needed reforms. We knew that we had a long row ahead. Our efforts to reduce drug prices face big-time opposition from Big Pharma.

As we worked side by side in a Republican and Democratic way, we planted the seeds to grow a strong bipartisan coalition—one strong enough, I believe, to withstand the influence of moneyed special interests.

Now, it should be no surprise to anybody that Big Pharma and other stakeholders in the drug supply chain are working six ways from Sunday to throw sand in our gears. We know they will continue to fight us during the August work period.

As a lifelong farmer from Iowa, I learned a long time ago that the fruits of one's labor will not be worth a hill of beans without proper groundwork. For months, we have been tilling the soil and fertilizing the legislative fields to bear fruit at harvest time. We have teamed up with leadership of other key committees of jurisdiction.

Together with the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Health Committee, Senators LAMAR ALEXANDER and PATTY MURRAY, and the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senators LINDSEY GRAHAM and DIANNE FEINSTEIN, the Senate has a real opportunity this Congress to deliver meaningful reforms that would yield real savings for what Americans spend on healthcare.

Both the Health and the Judiciary Committees have advanced legislative packages that help address drug prices, including bills I have sponsored, such as the CREATES Act, the Stop STALLING Act, and the Prescription Pricing for the People Act.

Since January, the Finance Committee, which I chair, and Senator WYDEN is the ranking member, has held a series of hearings to examine the vulnerabilities in the drug supply chain that are ripe for abuse. We don't have the answers to all the problems, but it is really crystal clear that a strong dose of transparency is desperately needed to shed light on a convoluted

pricing system when dealing with prescription drugs.

From the drug manufacturer to the patient's medicine cabinet, the drug supply chain is shrouded in secrecy and is exceedingly complex. This opaque pricing system has allowed exorbitant price hikes to climb higher and higher and higher, with no end in sight.

Don't forget, the taxpayers of the United States foot the bill for the lion's share of prescription drugs through Medicare and Medicaid.

The woolly drug supply chain allows taxpayers to be fleeced year after year. We need to let the sunshine in to help root out their abusive practices. Secrecy in the supply chain has grown into a noxious weed, damaging our free market ecosystem.

Transparency is needed to help rein in unsustainable costs threatening the fiscal viability of Medicaid and Medicare. Seniors, individuals with disability, and low-income Americans depend on these programs for lifesaving medicine and innovative cures.

Last week, the Senate Finance Committee approved the bipartisan Prescription Drug Price Reduction Act. The carefully sown Grassley-Wyden bill limits seniors' out-of-pocket costs without limiting access to lifesaving cures Americans expect. It injects reasonable incentives in government prescription drug programs for drug manufacturers and insurers to keep prices low. Pharmaceutical companies and insurers need to have more skin in the game to keep prices down. It also fixes flawed policies that distort free market principles to lower the lid on spending.

We all know in the town meetings and other places we go that Americans have spoken very loudly on this subject. They want high prescription drug prices addressed. Furthermore, Americans want Congress to act and to act now.

The Senate Finance, HELP, and Judiciary Committees have acted. Now it is time to get the job done.

As my fellow lawmakers go home over the August recess, I encourage each of you to share the good news with your constituents. Americans are fed up with sticker shock at the pharmacy counter. We have the opportunity to deliver a badly needed legislative remedy.

First, we have to drain the swampy special interests blocking the path to victory. The moneyed players in the drug supply chain will use the August recess to unleash a public relations blitz against our bipartisan efforts. You can bet the farm that Big Pharma, hospitals, and pharmacy benefit managers will whip themselves into a real frenzy to kill these bipartisan reforms.

Let's remember why we started down this path in the first place. It is simply democracy working, representative government working.

Americans are demanding relief at the prescription counter. We hear it from our constituents in our town meetings, in our letters, in our emails,

and in the phone calls we get. Unchecked drug prices are putting Medicare and Medicaid in financial peril. The payment structure is unmoored from fiscal reality, and the American taxpayer is on the hook. Congress has a real opportunity to do something about the spiraling of drug prices.

For my colleagues who are on the fence about our bipartisan proposal—and there is nothing wrong with being on the fence because you have plenty of time to become acquainted with an issue you hear from your constituents all the time and to become acquainted with our solution—here are a series of questions I want you to ask yourself: Do Americans want us to act to reduce runaway drug prices? Do Americans want to keep access to breakthrough drug therapies and innovation? Do older Americans want protection from coverage gaps and out-of-pocket costs? Do people with disabilities and poor and elderly Americans who depend on Medicaid deserve access to innovative cures and next-generation therapies?

The answer to all of these questions, I think, is a resounding yes.

Farmers are smart enough to make hay while the Sun shines. Let's apply that time-tested farm lesson in the Congress. Don't bail out on the opportunity to make a meaningful difference for the people whom we are elected to serve. Too many Americans are rationing or skipping doses because they can't afford their prescription medicines.

I will finish as I started out by saying, on behalf of Senator WYDEN, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator MURRAY, Senator GRAHAM, Senator FEINSTEIN, and others, I suggest to our colleagues that this is our Goldilocks moment. Let's not let it be a gridlock moment. Our legislative reforms are not too far right and not too far left. That is what makes our bipartisan remedy to lower prescription drug prices just exactly right for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following disposition of the Jordan nomination, the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the following nominations in the order listed: Executive Calendar Nos. 205, 231, 232, 233, 326, 327, 345, 350, 352, and 364, and then up to 10 minutes of debate under the control of Senator MENENDEZ prior to the vote on cloture on Calendar No. 402. I further ask consent that if cloture is invoked, the confirmation votes on the nominations be at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader. Finally, I ask consent that the cloture motions on the following nominations be withdrawn: Executive Calendar Nos. 48, 55, 344, 346, 351, and 394, and the Senate vote on the

nominations at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3877

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3877 be withdrawn and that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3877. I further ask consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, if cloture is filed on H.R. 3877, there be up to 2 hours of debate, equally divided between the leaders or their designees. I ask consent that the only amendment in order be Paul amendment No. 932 and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the amendment with a 60-affirmative-vote threshold needed for adoption. Finally, I ask consent that following the disposition of the Paul amendment, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture and that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON SEAN D. JORDAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the Jordan nomination.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Blunt	Burr
Barrasso	Boozman	Capito
Blackburn	Braun	Collins

Cornyn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cotton	Johnson	Romney
Cramer	Jones	Rounds
Crapo	Kennedy	Rubio
Cruz	Lankford	Sasse
Daines	Lee	Scott (FL)
Enzi	Manchin	Scott (SC)
Ernst	McConnell	Shelby
Fischer	McSally	Sinema
Gardner	Moran	Sullivan
Graham	Murkowski	Thune
Grassley	Paul	Tillis
Hawley	Perdue	Toomey
Hoeven	Portman	Wicker
Hyde-Smith	Risch	Young

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Tester
Casey	Merkley	Udall
Coons	Murphy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	
Feinstein	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The nomination was confirmed. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in the series be 10 minutes in length.

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

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 senior assistant 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 Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Tillis
Enzi	Moran	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Tester
Casey	Merkley	Udall
Coons	Murphy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	
Feinstein	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 34. The motion is agreed to.

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 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 Jeffrey Vincent Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Jeffrey Vincent Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

(Mr. SCOTT of Florida assumed the Chair.)

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 243 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Table with 3 columns of names: Alexander, Barrasso, Blackburn, Blunt, Boozman, Braun, Burr, Capito, Collins, Cornyn, Cotton, Cramer, Crapo, Cruz, Daines, Enzi, Ernst, Fischer, Gardner, Graham, Grassley, Hawley, Hoeven, Hyde-Smith, Inhofe, Johnson, Kennedy, Lankford, Lee, McConnell, McSally, Moran, Murkowski, Paul, Portman, Risch, Roberts, Romney, Rounds, Rubio, Sasse, Scott (FL), Scott (SC), Shelby, Sullivan, Thune, Tillis, Toomey, Wicker, Young

NAYS—37

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Blumenthal, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Coons, Cortez Masto, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Hassan, Heinrich, Hirono, Jones, King, Leahy, Manchin, Menendez, Merkley, Murphy, Murray, Peters, Reed, Rosen, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Sinema, Smith, Stabenow, Tester, Udall, Van Hollen, Whitehouse, Wyden

NOT VOTING—12

Table with 3 columns of names: Bennet, Booker, Cassidy, Gillibrand, Harris, Isakson, Kaine, Klobuchar, Markey, Sanders, Warner, Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

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 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 Brantley Starr, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Brantley Starr, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 244 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Table with 3 columns of names: Alexander, Barrasso, Blackburn, Blunt, Boozman, Braun, Burr, Capito, Collins, Cornyn, Cotton, Cramer, Crapo, Cruz, Daines, Enzi, Ernst, Fischer, Gardner, Graham, Grassley, Hawley, Hoeven, Hyde-Smith, Inhofe, Johnson, Kennedy, Lankford, Lee, McConnell, McSally, Moran, Murkowski, Paul, Portman, Risch, Roberts, Romney, Rounds, Rubio, Sasse, Scott (FL), Scott (SC), Shelby, Sullivan, Thune, Tillis, Toomey, Wicker, Young

NAYS—37

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Blumenthal, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Coons, Cortez Masto, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Hassan, Heinrich, Hirono, Jones, King, Leahy, Manchin, Menendez, Merkley, Murphy, Murray, Peters, Reed, Rosen, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Sinema

Table with 3 columns of names: Smith, Stabenow, Tester, Udall, Van Hollen, Whitehouse, Wyden

NOT VOTING—12

Table with 3 columns of names: Bennet, Booker, Cassidy, Gillibrand, Harris, Isakson, Kaine, Klobuchar, Markey, Sanders, Warner, Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

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 senior assistant 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 Stephanie L. Haines, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Stephanie L. Haines, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 245 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Table with 3 columns of names: Alexander, Baldwin, Barrasso, Blackburn, Blumenthal, Blunt, Boozman, Braun, Brown, Burr, Cantwell, Capito, Cardin, Carper, Casey

Collins	Johnson	Rosen
Coons	Jones	Rounds
Cornyn	Kennedy	Rubio
Cortez Masto	King	Sasse
Cotton	Lankford	Schatz
Cramer	Leahy	Schumer
Crapo	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Manchin	Scott (SC)
Daines	McConnell	Shaheen
Duckworth	McSally	Shelby
Durbin	Menendez	Sinema
Enzi	Merkley	Smith
Ernst	Moran	Stabenow
Feinstein	Murkowski	Sullivan
Fischer	Murphy	Tester
Gardner	Murray	Thune
Graham	Paul	Tillis
Grassley	Perdue	Toomey
Hassan	Peters	Udall
Hawley	Portman	Van Hollen
Heinrich	Reed	Whitehouse
Hoeven	Risch	Wicker
Hyde-Smith	Roberts	Wyden
Inhofe	Romney	Young

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

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 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 nomination of Ada E. Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Ada E. Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINÉ), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the

Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 246 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Heinrich	Rosen
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Jones	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Shaheen
Collins	King	Shelby
Coons	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Leahy	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lee	Smith
Cotton	Manchin	Sullivan
Cramer	McConnell	Tester
Crapo	McSally	Thune
Cruz	Menendez	Tillis
Daines	Merkley	Toomey
Duckworth	Moran	Udall
Durbin	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

NAYS—9

Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Murray	Stabenow
Cantwell	Schatz	Wyden

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays are 9.

The motion is agreed to.

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 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 Steven D. Grimberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Steven D. Grimberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rules.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINÉ), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 247 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Alexander	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Blackburn	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hassan	Roberts
Burr	Hawley	Romney
Capito	Hoeven	Rosen
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Coons	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	King	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Leahy	Sinema
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Tester
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Tillis
Duckworth	Moran	Toomey
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—16

Baldwin	Menendez	Stabenow
Blumenthal	Merkley	Udall
Brown	Murray	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Schatz	Wyden
Heinrich	Schumer	
Hirono	Smith	

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 72, the nays are 16.

The motion is agreed to.

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 Jason K. Pulliam, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Jason K. Pulliam, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Tillis
Enzi	Moran	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Tester
Casey	Merkley	Udall
Coons	Murphy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	
Feinstein	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 34.

The motion is agreed to.

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 Martha Maria Pacold, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Martha Maria Pacold, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 249 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Cantwell	Cramer
Baldwin	Capito	Crapo
Barrasso	Cardin	Cruz
Blackburn	Carper	Daines
Blumenthal	Casey	Duckworth
Blunt	Collins	Durbin
Boozman	Coons	Enzi
Braun	Cornyn	Ernst
Brown	Cortez Masto	Feinstein
Burr	Cotton	Fischer

Gardner	Merkley	Scott (FL)
Graham	Moran	Scott (SC)
Grassley	Murkowski	Shaheen
Hassan	Murphy	Shelby
Hawley	Murray	Sinema
Heinrich	Paul	Smith
Hoeven	Perdue	Stabenow
Hyde-Smith	Peters	Sullivan
Inhofe	Portman	Tester
Johnson	Reed	Thune
Jones	Risch	Tillis
Kennedy	Roberts	Toomey
King	Romney	Udall
Lankford	Rosen	Van Hollen
Leahy	Rounds	Whitehouse
Lee	Rubio	Wicker
Manchin	Sasse	Wyden
McConnell	Schatz	Young
McSally	Schumer	

NAYS—2

Hirono	Menendez
--------	----------

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 2.

The motion is agreed to.

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 senior assistant 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 Steven C. Seeger, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 Steven C. Seeger, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from

Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 250 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson	Schumer
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Sinema
Coons	Lee	Smith
Cornyn	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Sullivan
Cotton	McSally	Tester
Cramer	Menendez	Thune
Crapo	Merkley	Tillis
Cruz	Moran	Toomey
Daines	Murkowski	Udall
Duckworth	Murphy	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Enzi	Paul	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	Young

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

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 senior assistant 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 William Shaw Stickman IV, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, 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 William Shaw Stickman IV, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 251 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Casey	Jones	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sinema
Cramer	Manchin	Sullivan
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Perdue	Young

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Wyden
Durbin	Peters	
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Markey
Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Kaine	Warner
Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 31.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATION OF KELLY CRAFT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Ms. Kelly Craft to serve as the next U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

As a firm believer in the strength and power of U.S. diplomacy, there are three main reasons I oppose Ambassador Craft's nomination.

First and foremost, she lacks the experience necessary to stand up for American values and promote our national security on the global stage.

Second, during her brief diplomatic tenure in Canada, she posted so many absences that I cannot describe it as anything less than a dereliction of duty.

Ambassador Craft has also been unable or unwilling to convince the Senate that she will fully separate her professional obligations from her family's business interests. We cannot have an ambassador to the United Nations who risks using this incredibly influential position in ways that could benefit her own family's finances.

This position is one of the most important diplomatic posts in our government. It is a global stage, and every leader who serves in this role must always put country first.

Since its founding, some of our most distinguished public servants have represented the United States at the U.N.: George H. W. Bush, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Thomas Pickering, Madeleine Albright, John Negroponte, Susan Rice, and Samantha Power.

These Americans brought to the table years of experience as former Ambassadors, senior State Department officials, National Security Council staff, and more. Ambassador Craft simply cannot match the foreign policy and national security expertise offered by these distinguished leaders.

Before serving as the U.S. Ambassador to Canada, she had no previous significant foreign policy experience or executive experience at all. It would seem that her most relevant credential is that she, along with her husband, contributed more than \$1 million to the President's campaign.

During the confirmation process, Ambassador Craft's performance suggested a deep lack of knowledge and applicable experience.

I want to be clear. This is not a judgment on her character. This is merely an assessment of her ability to represent the United States of America on the world stage where she will grapple with some of the most complex and challenging foreign policy issues of our time.

When asked at her hearing to identify the most pressing issues facing the U.N. and comment on how the United States could leverage the U.N. to pursue our national foreign policy priorities, Craft displayed no sophisticated understanding of the many challenges confronting our country.

She failed to mention North Korea's aggression on nuclear proliferation. She failed to mention ongoing threats from Iran. She failed to mention China's growing power and Russia's continued malign influence. When asked about the two-state solution, she could not articulate a viewpoint. When asked by Senator PAUL whether she believed the Iraq war was a mistake, she replied that she was "not going to second guess the . . . Bush administration."

In response to Senator CARDIN's question about the threat of climate change, she said that the United States does not need to be a member of the

Paris climate agreement in order to show leadership. All the more disturbing are her past comments on climate change, such as when she said, “I believe there are scientists on both sides that are accurate.”

Taken together, these answers should alarm anyone who hopes that the United States can use our power, our influence, and our leadership position to promote our interests and answer the great challenges of our time. Simply put, never in our Nation’s history has a President nominated such an underqualified person to this critical post just for being a donor.

Ms. Craft also lacks the professionalism needed to be the U.N. Ambassador. As our Ambassador to Canada, she had one job: to represent the United States in Canada. Yet, during her time in Ottawa, the defining characteristic of her service appears to be how little time she actually spent there.

The numbers speak for themselves. During the 608 days she served as U.S. Ambassador in Ottawa, she spent 357 days outside of Canada. Let me repeat that. During her 21 months assigned to Ottawa, she spent an entire year out of Canada.

For my colleagues who insist she was engaged in trade negotiations, the State Department’s own records suggest otherwise. Indeed, the record shows she spent only 40 days on travel related to USMCA. She did, however, spend 210 days at her homes in Kentucky or Oklahoma. I repeat, she spent 7 of her 21 months as our Ambassador in Canada at home in the United States. The last time I checked, not a single round of the USMCA negotiations took place in Kentucky or Oklahoma.

Additionally, while Ms. Craft claims that she always received approval from her travel, records show that she spent at least 11 days out of the country without State Department approval. Should she be confirmed as Ambassador of the U.N., I think it is very fair to say that if an international crisis erupts, that might more likely find her in Kentucky than New York City.

Ambassador Craft’s absences represent a total abdication of her responsibility as the head of the U.S. Embassy in Canada—one of our Nation’s most vital allies.

In one troubling instance, during the month when the Trump administration shut down the Federal Government, Ambassador Craft was in Ottawa for only 2 days. Rather than provide leadership to Embassy personnel during uncertain times, she was at home in Kentucky. Perhaps she thought she was nonessential personnel.

Finally, Ms. Craft has also displayed a lack of diligence when it comes to preventing conflicts of interest. I know this administration has sunk to some new lows when it comes to mixing family business with national security, but that doesn’t mean it is OK. Norms are only as strong as our will to stand up

and defend them. That is why we must push back against self-promotion at the expense of the American people.

We also know that Ambassador Craft’s husband, Joe Craft, runs the second largest coal producer in the Eastern United States and has lobbied the EPA to roll back regulations against air and water pollution. Ms. Craft insisted to the committee that her husband “plays no role whatsoever in official U.S. government business,” but email and calendar records tell a different story. When Ambassador Craft needed information about a U.S. environmental project, she asked her husband—not Embassy employees—to connect her to former EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. When the EPA sent the requested information to the Ambassador, they included her spouse on the response. In addition, according to official calendars, Mr. Craft participated in at least four meetings with U.S. or Canadian Government energy and environmental officials. The potential conflicts of interest are staggering.

The nomination of Ms. Craft to this position underscores the Trump administration’s total lack of respect for the work of diplomacy, for our diplomats, and for the United Nations.

Taken together, Ambassador Craft’s lack of experience, her dereliction of duty and excessive absences in Ottawa, and her unwillingness to address potential conflicts of interest render her unfit to serve as our Ambassador to the United Nations.

In a world of growing challenges, the American people deserve a serious, thoughtful, and proven leader to represent their interests at the United Nations. They deserve a leader who can leverage the United Nations to advance our national security interests and ultimately build a safer, more stable, prosperous world. They deserve a leader who will put the interests of the people over the profits of their family. Kelly Knight Craft is not that leader. For those reasons, I will vote no on this nomination and urge my colleagues to join me.

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 senior assistant 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 Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Lamar Alexander, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Susan M. Collins, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker,

Bill Cassidy, John Thune, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Mitch McConnell.

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 Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted “yea”.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 252 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Coons	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shaheen
Cotton	Lee	Shelby
Cramer	Manchin	Sinema
Crapo	McConnell	Sullivan
Cruz	McSally	Thune
Daines	Moran	Tillis
Enzi	Murkowski	Toomey
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warner
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Cassidy	Klobuchar	
Gillibrand	Markey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Norquist nomination, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Norquist nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider the Jordan nomination be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam 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.

TRIBUTE TO KATHRYN WEEDEN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today I join my friend the majority

leader in offering a heartfelt thank you, congratulations, and happy retirement to the principal of the Senate Page School, Ms. Kathryn Weeden. She leaves the Senate and the Page School after 26 years of illustrious service. In that time, she has transformed the lives of countless young men and women interested in the workings of government.

The Senate Page School is an institution unlike any other on Capitol Hill and very different from most schools in America. Every semester, some of the most accomplished young men and women come to Washington from across the country to learn about our government. In short order, they are thrown into a routine that includes classes early in the morning, classes late into the night, and a full-time job in the Senate in between. When you consider the additional demands of homework, getting acclimated to a new city, and new peers, you realize just how important it is for these young men and women to have someone they can trust, rely on, and go to for support and guidance. For the last 26 years, that person has been Ms. Weeden. With her at the helm, I have always had confidence that the Senate's pages were getting the learning experience of their lives.

For the minds she has inspired, for the institution she has shaped, and for the Nation she has served, I want to say thank you and my best wishes to Ms. Weeden. May others follow in the example of selflessness and civic duty that she has gracefully set.

TRIBUTE TO SABRA FIELD

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, over a storied 50-year career, Sabra Field has established herself as a great Vermont artist. Her works have made hers a unique and highly sought-after brand, one which beautifully depicts Vermont's landscape. Her prints, made by hand using woodblocks, are a premier example of how Vermonters harbor a deep commitment to creating and providing high-quality goods, made with passion. Her work has promoted Vermont, and I could not be more proud to recognize this acclaimed artist.

Sabra enrolled at Middlebury College in 1953, where she was inspired by Piero della Francesca's painting "The Flagellation of Christ." One of her instructors instilled a belief within her that, in her words, made art "seem like a noble calling." Sabra has followed this calling over the last 50-years, creating beautiful works of art that portray Vermont's landscapes. Born in Oklahoma and raised in neighboring New York, Sabra believes that her professional career began when she moved to Vermont. She recalled in a Vermont Digger article that "Vermont was beautiful and Vermonters unpretentious, generous, and understood 'home occupation.' I was free to be me." This environment made Vermont

an ideal work and home location for Sabra.

Sabra's achievements are impressive. Her work has been featured on the cover of Vermont Life magazine. It is showcased in a stained glass window at Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center in New Hampshire. It has been printed on 250,000 UNICEF Cards. And Sabra's work was featured on 60 million postage stamps commemorating Vermont's 1991 bicentennial. Sabra's work has gained popularity far and wide over the last five decades. Marcelle and I have several of her prints in our home as well.

I am proud to recognize the contribution and achievements that Sabra has made over her 50 years in Vermont. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Vermont Digger article titled "Sabra Field marks 50th year making Vermont Art." It describes the hard work that goes into making each piece of art and highlights Field's commitment to capturing Vermont's picturesque landscape.

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

[From the Vermont Digger, July 7, 2019]

SABRA FIELD MARKS 50TH YEAR MAKING VERMONT ART

(By Kevin O'Connor)

EAST BARNARD.—Sabra Field recalls the moment a half-century ago when she made her first woodblock print in Vermont.

"No one said I couldn't," she says, "and I was too naive to realize the odds."

The Oklahoma-born and New York-raised artist didn't know her ink-on-paper images of red barns, green hills and blue skies would land on the cover of Vermont Life magazine, an annual namesake calendar, a stained glass window at neighboring New Hampshire's Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, 250,000 UNICEF cards and 60 million postage stamps commemorating Vermont's 1991 bicentennial.

This coming weekend, the 84-year-old printmaker will celebrate her 50th year making iconic Vermont art.

"When people ask what piece means the most to me," she says, "I answer, 'The one I'm going to do next.'"

Field's Green Mountain story began in 1953 when she enrolled at Middlebury College ("there was no math requirement," she explains) and had an epiphany while studying Piero della Francesca's 1450s painting "The Flagellation of Christ."

"I saw that great art is composed from what we see," she recalls, "but it is not a replica of what we see."

Field's watercolor teacher made art "seem like a noble calling." But she yearned less for a brush than for woodblocks, which she discovered upon further schooling at Connecticut's Wesleyan University.

"Prints are for everybody," she says of the easily reproducible medium. "I wanted to spend all my time making images and I was willing to take the risk. I felt, in a sense, that I had no choice."

"Over the course of her career she has received any number of accolades, and has been variously described as 'the Grant Wood of Vermont,' 'the artist laureate of Vermont,' and as someone who 'has touched more lives than any Vermont artist in history,'" Richard Saunders, a Middlebury College professor and director of its Museum of Art, wrote in the catalogue of the 2017 retrospective "Sabra Field, Then and Now."

Yet every peak in this artist's world is framed by valleys. The mother of two young sons moved from Connecticut to a former 19th-century tavern in the White River valley village of East Barnard after her first marriage ended in 1969.

"When I arrived, people were unsure," she recalls. "Is she just here for the summer?"

Field soon contacted the secretary of state's office to register a printmaking business.

"Somehow I knew I wanted the legitimacy of being validated."

Tallying initial sales on her children's toy cash register, Field began to design, draw and cut the woodblock images that have sustained her ever since.

"My life as a professional artist really didn't begin until I moved," she says. "Vermont was beautiful and Vermonters unpretentious, generous, and understood 'home occupation.' I was free to be me."

Field soon met her second husband, Spencer, who became her business manager. But her work wasn't always seen as marketable. Take the story behind her 1977 four-print "Mountain Suite."

"Vermont Life requested a seasonal suite to sell," she recalls. "Then they declined to buy them."

The artist went on to distribute the images herself. The magazine has since folded. But log onto her website and you'll see the passed-over prints remain in circulation for \$250 each.

Field's resulting career has been chronicled in two books—2002's "The Art of Place" and 2004's "In Sight"—and the 2015 documentary "Sabra." Middlebury College, for its part, has an archive copy of every one of her prints.

Field can share stories of private struggle as well as of professional success. She re-winds back five decades to inking her first works.

"I hung them outside to dry."

The wind wasn't the only thing that got carried away that day.

Field has weathered bigger changes ranging from the advent of new reproduction technology for the prints she continues to create by hand to the 2010 death of her husband. Now assisted by fellow printmaker and neighbor Jeanne Amato, she still works with woodblocks, be it for a recent children's book "Where Do They Go?" with Addison County writer Julia Alvarez or a coming nine-piece suite of prints she conceived after President Donald Trump's election.

"I decided we needed to look at it as a challenge and we couldn't let him manipulate our emotions," she says of the Trump-inspired prints. As for exactly what they picture, she adds only: "They will be somewhat mysterious. But when you get it, you get it."

Field is marking her 50th year in Vermont with a special poster and open house at her East Barnard studio July 13 and 14 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., with more information available on her website.

"The career highs that sustain me are not glamorous by the standards of the wider world, but they confirm that I made the right decision and that this wonderful place is home," she says. "I've never fallen out of love with my medium. I couldn't be happy otherwise."

RECOGNIZING WHITE RIVER JUNCTION FEMALE ENTREPRENEURS

Mr. LEAHY, Madam President, White River Junction, VT, has seen a renaissance over the last 20 years. Led by a band of female entrepreneurs, this village tucked along the Connecticut

River is today the home of dozens of thriving businesses. No fewer than 25 of these business are run by women, and together they are the core of a vibrant, growing community.

Kim Souza, the owner of the consignment store Revolution, was one of the first business owners to move back to White River Junction. The first few years were tough, but with the support of her community, Revolution found its footing. Soon more businesses opened, and new life was breathed into the town.

Across the street, Julie Sumanis and Elenda Taylor opened JUEL, a juice bar and café, in the ground floor of a new apartment building. In 2008, Leslie Carleton moved from nearby Norwich to open Upper Valley Yoga. Seven years later, Kate Gamble opened Open Door, another yoga studio.

The successes of these businesses did not come without challenges and difficulties, but their successes showcase the power of bold ideas, commitment, dedication, and, ultimately, community. In 2007, Kim thought Revolution would have to close its doors, until she found the backing of a local mother and daughter that allowed her to stay open. Catherine Doherty, the producing director of White River's Northern Stage theatre company, credits the community's support for keeping the company alive through challenging times.

Today, White River Junction has become a destination and a cultural center of the region. The surge of development brought on by pioneers like Kim continues to bring new people into the town, some feeling empowered to start businesses of their own, to shape their futures, and to make the community stronger. This is the very heart of the American dream. The future of Vermont rests with entrepreneurs across the State, and I am glad to see it in such capable hands.

I am proud to recognize the achievements of these women and the contributions they have made to the town of White River Junction and their broader communities. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD a Boston Globe article titled "In White River Junction, sisters are doing it for themselves." It describes their successes and the challenges they overcame in helping to revive their town.

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

[From the Boston Globe, July 4, 2019]

IN WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, SISTERS ARE DOING IT FOR THEMSELVES

(By Kevin Cullen)

WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT.—Kim Souza opened her consignment and thrift clothing store here in 2002, when this old, wheezy village hard by the New Hampshire border was so deserted you half-expected to see tumbleweeds rolling down North Main Street.

She let the locals know that beyond selling new clothing, she would also sell used stuff and offered to buy gently used clothes from them.

Dancers at The Wrap, a strip joint directly across the street from Souza's shop, began showing up regularly with outrageously high platform shoes and audacious, skimpy outfits. Souza had to wave them off when the strippers tried to sell her their thongs.

"I had to draw the line somewhere," Souza said, standing behind the counter of her store next to an elaborate cappuccino machine.

The Wrap burned to the ground years ago, and in its place has risen, phoenix-like, a modern apartment building, the anchor of which is a ground-level cafe, apothecary, and juice bar called JUEL, after its owners, Julie Sumanis and Elena Taylor.

The cafe, located on the corner of North Main and Bridge streets, in the heart of downtown, captures the essence of the renaissance of this old industrial village: On the same spot where women were once exploited and objectified, two young female entrepreneurs are running a thriving business.

Souza, White River's pioneering businesswoman, recently did some research and figured out that no less than 25 businesses that have opened in the once-vacant and newly built storefronts in the four-block downtown area are run by women.

It wasn't planned. It isn't part of some high-minded government-incentive program. It just happened. Organically.

Souza was working at a travel agency in New Hampshire when a mentor, Murray Washburn, suggested she start a business in gritty White River, which is sandwiched in the Upper Valley between the more genteel locales of Hanover in New Hampshire and Woodstock in Vermont.

Souza went for it, opening a funky clothing store in what had been a frame shop for 30 years and called it Revolution, which was prescient because she started one.

Things were slow at first. After four years, Souza thought she would have to go out of business. A local woman, Ann Johnston, and her then-teenage daughter, Simran, loved the store and were crestfallen when Souza told them she was going to close up.

"What would it take to keep Revolution open?" Ann Johnston asked.

The answer was financial backing, which Johnston and her daughter provided, giving new, sustained life to Revolution, and the revolution of female businesses.

Souza said Leslie Carleton's decision to open Upper Valley Yoga on North Main Street in 2008 was a pivotal moment. Carleton's previous studio was in Norwich, a nearby, more upscale town. Many of Carleton's well-heeled students followed her, with some trepidation, to White River.

Those mostly female yogis discovered something that Souza has immortalized on a T-shirt she sells, emblazoned with the words, "White River Junction" on the front, and, on the back, "It's not so bad."

"When I came to White River Junction," Carleton said, sitting at a table outside JUEL, "it was still pretty rough. It was dead on a Sunday morning. The sleazy strip club was still there. The ATM at the strip club dispensed only \$1 and \$5 bills."

But Carleton hung in there, and other yoga studios have followed.

Four years ago, Kate Gamble, a physical therapist, opened Open Door, a one-stop wellness center, offering services including yoga, physical therapy, acupuncture, and Chinese medicine. At something she hosts called The Death Cafe, a hospice nurse helps people "be more comfortable about end of life issues," Gamble said.

"This place reminds me of Brooklyn," Gamble said. "It was a dump, but a lot of people with energy and new ideas have moved in and changed things."

Carleton harbors a nagging worry that it might become too much like Brooklyn, with rents soaring and inventory drying up.

But given what White River Junction looked like and felt like not so long ago, the pros seem to far outweigh the cons, and officials in the town of Hartford, where White River is located, are thrilled with all the new businesses and tax revenue.

And as freight trains roll through the downtown regularly, blowing their horns, White River is not in danger of becoming precious or pretentious any time soon. It retains a chunk of its old grittiness.

Taylor, 37, and Sumanis, 31, became fast friends when they worked as waitresses at Elixir, an upscale restaurant here. They had a shared interest in wellness, herbalism, and eating healthy. More importantly, their bosses, Skip Symanski and Jane Carrier, had set an example.

When Symanski and Carrier opened a high-end restaurant here 10 years ago, people thought they were nuts. But Taylor and Sumanis learned that if you build a quality business, the people will come. It gave them the gumption to strike out on their own. Three years ago, they started with a food truck. When space became available in a new building, they went all in.

"Elixir paved the way for a lot of us," Sumanis said.

They also point to Souza as a nurturing maternal figure to younger entrepreneurs.

Souza gives credit to the male developers who remade the town's footprint, but agrees there is a mutually supportive business climate that has an especially feminine side to it.

"Women are by nature nurturing," she said. "There is a lot of mutual support and encouragement going on here."

Given that they both offer yoga classes, Carleton and Gamble are technically competitors. But they routinely send customers to each other's business, depending on what those customers want and need.

"Everybody has each other's back," said Taylor, who has given spare keys for JUEL to Gamble and Souza, whose businesses are right across North Main.

There are downsides to all this progress and prosperity. You used to be able to park an aircraft carrier along North Main Street. Now they limit free parking to two hours between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., from Monday to Saturday. Things can get tight, especially on weekends.

And, this being Vermont, there are some who decry what they dismiss as gentrification.

A local blogger, Rejjie Carter, bemoaned what he calls the colonization of White River Junction, writing that the land where it sits belonged to the Abenaki tribe before settlers showed up, and that landlords are now cashing in and driving out poorer residents.

"Colonialism, capitalism, and private property are the enemies," Carter wrote.

Like I said, this is Vermont.

Souza, who is a town selectboard member and committed to many social justice causes, bristles at characterizing what has happened here as gentrification.

"When women are opening businesses in a defunct town, it's less about money and power and more about care and community," she said. "Gentrification happens when people are displaced. There were no people in White River Junction when developers like Matt Bucy, Mike Davidson, and Bill Bittinger came along. Almost every single one of the old empty buildings they rehabbed or the new buildings they erected in vacant lots added affordable living space to our community."

Two months ago, a teacher from the Hartford public schools brought a bunch of students on a field trip to visit some of the female-run businesses.

"It was a joy to listen to so many of the young girls ask questions about how to start

a business," said Souza. "It felt like something was happening."

RECOGNIZING VERMONT'S MAGICIANS WITHOUT BORDERS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, when Lincoln, VT, resident Tom Verner performs magic shows for children in refugee camps, orphanages, and hospitals, he brings joy and laughter to the places where it is most needed. In 2002, Tom and his wife, Janet Fredericks, co-founded Magicians Without Borders and have since performed in more than 40 countries, for more than 1,000,000 of the world's most vulnerable people. Magicians Without Borders is one shining example of Vermonters thinking outside the box and using their creativity to make the world a better place. It is with pride and appreciation that I recognize Tom, Janet and the Magicians Without Borders organization for their achievements.

Tom was a professor of psychology in 2001 when he embarked on a trip through the Balkans, performing magic shows in the refugee camps of Kosovo and Macedonia. The performances were so well received that, upon returning to Vermont, Tom took a year off from his position at Burlington College to found Magicians Without Borders.

Since Tom's first trip, he and Janet have made six trips each year, continuing to use magic to transform the lives of youth in at risk situations around the globe. Tom, Janet, and Magicians Without Borders have performed everywhere from the Sudan, to Colombia, from Ukraine to Bangladesh. They traveled to Thailand and Burma for a month of performances in the wake of a tsunami and performed statewide throughout Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana after Hurricane Katrina.

In 2004, a series of shows at rural schools in El Salvador was met with such positivity that Tom was asked to teach a few magic tricks to the students. These impromptu classes turned into a unique, long-term education program geared toward increasing self-confidence, discipline, focus, and self-esteem. Tom, Janet, and Magicians Without Borders have now returned to El Salvador more than 30 times to entertain and educate these children who find themselves surrounded by terrible gang violence and abject poverty. The program has inspired young Salvadoran magicians to perform their own magic shows in orphanages, hospitals, and disaster areas and aspire to teach magic to other young people.

Due to their success in El Salvador, Magicians Without Borders expanded these education programs to Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, and the United States. Two additional education programs have been implemented in India.

I am proud to recognize the contributions that Tom, Janet, and Magicians Without Borders have made me so many communities across globe in the last 18 years. I ask unanimous consent

to have printed in the RECORD an Addison Independent article titled "Lincoln Magicians Bring Joy to Refugees at the Border." It describes how Tom and Janet use magic to connect with those suffering at our southern border and how they have expanded their mission to entertain, educate and empower across the world.

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

[From the Addison Independent, July 3, 2019]

LINCOLN MAGICIANS BRING JOY TO REFUGEES AT THE BORDER

LINCOLN.—Tom Verner and Janet Fredericks performed magic at the U.S.-Mexico border last December.

Not the kind of magic that allows tired, hungry and fearful refugees to simply waltz across the border to new lives in America. The Lincoln couple, working as Magicians Without Borders, staged a show of sleights-of-hand and humor designed to not only entertain, but also to provide a light of hope in dark circumstances.

Since that December trip, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than half a million additional migrants hoping to enter the U.S. The vast majority of these refugees were arrested and detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in facilities that a growing number of experts, including Holocaust scholars, have compared to concentration camps.

Performing at the border last year, and again this past March, has helped Verner and Fredericks better understand the issues there.

"These refugees didn't want to leave their homes," Verner told the Independent this week. "They're fleeing murderous violence, political oppression and grinding poverty, and they're coming to the closest place where, as the Statue of Liberty says, they can 'breathe free.'"

During their March trip, Verner and Fredericks met a six-year-old boy named Sebastian, whose family had fled Honduras. Because Sebastian has cerebral palsy and cannot walk, his father had carried him on his back—for more than 1,800 miles.

The conditions and political climate of the U.S. border are nothing, however, compared with those in Honduras, Sebastian's father told Verner.

It's the kind of story the Lincoln residents have encountered over and over again—all over the world.

Since founding Magicians Without Borders in 2002, Verner and Fredericks have traveled to more than 40 countries and performed for "over 1 million of the most forgotten people in the world."

Their mission is to entertain, educate and empower.

BEGINNINGS

In 2001 Verner, then a professor of psychology at Burlington College, was traveling through the Balkans, performing magic shows in refugee camps in Kosovo and Macedonia.

"It was a transformative experience," he said.

In one Macedonian camp, which sheltered about 2,000 people, mostly Roma, Verner met a little girl named Fatima who became his "assistant" for the day.

"We couldn't understand each other's languages, but we understood each other," Verner said. When it came time for Verner to move on to the next camp, however, he could not find Fatima to say good-bye. Disappointed, he returned to his car, only to find Fatima hiding in the back seat. She

begged Verner to take her with him, but he could not.

Verner's driver then suggested they visit Shutka, Macedonia, which the driver said was "swollen with refugees." Within 10 minutes of their arrival in the main square more than 300 people had gathered to watch him perform, Verner said.

Afterward, he recalled, "a Roma woman who'd seen me multiplying things in my show, came up to me holding a five-dinari Macedonian coin. 'Make more money,' she said. She thought if I could make things multiply, why not money?"

Verner performed a trick producing a 50-dinari coin—the equivalent of about 80 cents at the time—and the woman was genuinely thrilled.

After she walked away, two Roma men who'd been watching asked Verner if he could produce visas to America.

"They were completely serious," Verner said. "As if I could wave a magic wand and Condoleezza Rice would suddenly sign the necessary paperwork."

These and other encounters led to an epiphany for Verner, which he distills into a quote from fellow magician Harry Houdini—himself a refugee from Hungary:

"In certain circumstances, magic not only amazes and amuses but it has the power to awaken hope that the impossible is possible."

Upon his return to Vermont, Verner obtained a year's leave from Burlington College to found Magicians Without Borders.

"That one year has turned into 18," he said happily.

TEACHING MAGIC

In 2004, Magicians Without Borders (MWB) visited El Salvador, which was still reeling in the aftermath of a 12-year civil war that had been fought in large part by child soldiers.

The founder-director of the Salvadoran Rural Health Association was so impressed with Verner's school performances that she asked him to teach some magic tricks to children participating in a program called "Barefoot Angels" (so named because many of the children had been working barefoot in a garbage dump). Verner readily agreed.

At the end of that daylong workshop, one of the students, 14-year-old Jaime Zumba, asked, "When are you coming back?" Verner, who had had no return plans, hesitated, then said, "How about May?"

That moment, Verner said, changed the course of MWB. Since then he's visited El Salvador more than 30 times.

Soon, some of the children wanted to do more than just learn a few magic tricks. They were aspiring to teach it to other children. As a result, MWB now has programs in Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador and Costa Rica.

Two more programs have evolved in India, as well—one at a night-care shelter for the children of brothel workers who are trapped in the sex trade.

"These were children who had been sleeping under mom's bed while she was working," Verner recalled soberly.

That program's Hindi name, Prerana, translates into English as "Inspiration."

DREAMS

"We're not trying to teach them to be magicians," Verner said. "We're trying to build their confidence in themselves. What happens is that these kids start studying and performing, and something starts to happen, you start to see all these benefits. It awakens dreams."

Verner spoke of children who've gone on to pursue studies in nursing, culinary arts and social work.

None of this would have been possible, however, without the generous support

Verner and Fredericks have received over the years, both abroad and at home.

In the coming weeks, for instance, allies of MWB have scheduled two fundraising events at Bixby Library in Vergennes, which they hope will help fund another trip to the U.S.-Mexico border in August.

Magicians Without Borders will perform for children at the Bixby on July 25, from 6:30 to 8 p.m., then give a brief talk about their work.

An event on Aug. 1, from 7 to 8:30 p.m., will be geared toward adults: travel stories and performance history, with some magic woven in.

Verner hopes MWB can make multiple trips to the border in the future, in part because he knows what's at stake. After all, even his own sources of hope and inspiration have emerged from deeply, shockingly tragic circumstances.

Jaime Zumba's enthusiasm in El Salvador 15 years ago may have changed the course of MWB, but the young man's lived experience, like that of so many thousands who have fled their homes, is all too familiar in that part of the world and often inspires too little notice.

"It is not uncommon," he once told Verner, "for me to walk over a decapitated naked body on my way to school."

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCHE, Madam 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. JAMES E. RISCHE,
*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. 19-35 concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Canada for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$44 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. 19-35

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 *\$38 million.
Other \$6 million.
Total \$44 million.

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

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred fifty-two (152) MIDS JTRS (5) with Remote Power Supply.

Non-MDE: Also included are spare cables and MIDS batteries; Link-16 mobile racks; diagnostic support tools; technical documentation; training and engineering technical support; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (CN-P-LKT).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(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: July 29, 2019.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Canada—Multifunctional Information Distribution System (MIDS)—Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS)(5)

The Government of Canada has requested to buy one hundred fifty-two (152) MIDS JTRS (5) with Remote Power Supply. Also included are spare cables and MIDS batteries; Link-16 mobile racks; diagnostic support tools; technical documentation; training and engineering technical support; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$44 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the military capability of Canada, a NATO ally that is an important force for ensuring political stability and economic progress and a contributor to military, peacekeeping and humanitarian operations around the world.

Canada intends to upgrade its current inventory of CF-18 Aircraft, CC-130J, and the Royal Canadian Air Force's Ground Stations with the purchase of these MIDS JTRS (5) terminals to be fully interoperable with U.S. and allied forces to support and complement joint operations in a net-enabled environment; have modernized electronic protection and secure, jam-resistant wave forms; and be capable of improved Link-16 message exchange and information fidelity including support to advanced weapon employment. Canada will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

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

The principal contractors for MIDS JTRS are Viasat, Incorporated, headquartered in Carlsbad, CA and Data Link Solutions, headquartered in Cedar Rapids, IA. The Government of Canada is expected to negotiate an offset agreement with the principal contractor(s), in accordance with Canada's Industrial and Technological Benefits (ITB) Policy, before signing the Letter of Offer and Acceptance (LOA), but details are not known at this time.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of additional U.S.

Government or contractor representatives to Canada. However, it is anticipated that engineering and technical support services provided by the U.S. Government may be required on an interim basis for training and technical assistance.

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

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-35

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 Multifunctional Information Distribution System (MIDS) Joint Tactical Radio (JTRS) is a software defined radio. The MIDS JTRS Programmable Secure Information Security Architecture Module (PSISAM) is Critical Program Information (CPI). The PSISAM is embedded in a MIDS JTRS Shop Replaceable Unit (SRU) and contains the information security hardware and cryptographic keys necessary to operate the terminal. MIDS JTRS contains embedded COMSEC and is capable of processing up to TOP SECRET information. Each MIDS JTRS contains an embedded SRU that is UNCLASSIFIED Controlled Cryptographic Information (CCI). Un-keyed terminals and de-energized terminals are UNCLASSIFIED CCI. When a terminal is operating on the host platform it is classified up to the level of data being transmitted.

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

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

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Canada.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH, Madam 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. JAMES E. RISCH,
*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. 19-40 concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Egypt for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$554 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. 19-40

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 Egypt.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$0 million.

Other \$554 million.

Total \$554 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case EG-P-GKB, implemented in September 2018, was below congressional notification threshold at \$45 million (\$0 in MDE) and provided for material and labor services in support of Oliver Hazard Perry Class Frigates (FFG-7), Fast Missile Craft (FMC), Mine Hunter Coastal (MHC) ships, Coastal Mine Hunter (CMH) ships, and 25 Meter and 28 Meter Fast Patrol Craft (FPC). Egypt has requested the case be amended to continue providing the same support on the basic case. This amendment will push the current case above the non-MDE or services congressional notification threshold and thus requires notification of the entire case.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: Provides for material and labor services in support of Oliver Hazard Perry Class Frigates (FFG-7 class ships), Fast Missile Craft (FMC), Mine Hunter Coastal (MHC) ships, Coastal Mine Hunter (CMH) ships, and 25 Meter and 28 Meter Fast Patrol Craft (FPC).

(iv) Military Department: Navy (EG-P-GKB).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(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: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 29, 2019.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Egypt—Follow on Technical Support (FOTS)

The Government of Egypt has requested a possible sale of Follow on Technical Support (FOTS) that provides for material and labor services in support of Oliver Hazard Perry Class Frigates (FFG-7 class ships), Fast Missile Craft (FMC), Mine Hunter Coastal (MHC) ships, Coastal Mine Hunter (CMH) ships, and 25 Meter and 28 Meter Fast Patrol Craft (FPC). The estimated cost is \$554 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to provide a strategic partner with critical support for multiple type ships responsible for Egypt's maritime security. The proposed sale is essential to main-

tain Egypt's national security, regional stability, and the free flow of worldwide commerce via the Suez Canal.

Egypt intends to use this technical maintenance and service support to ensure the Egyptian Navy is operationally capable of providing coastal defense and security. The proposed sale will increase the Egyptian Navy's material and operational readiness. Egypt will have no difficulties absorbing this support into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor for Engineering Services Support will be VSE Corporation and U.S. Government activities will provide FOTS for Egypt. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require periodic trips to Egypt involving U.S. Government and contractor representatives for technical reviews, support, and oversight for approximately five years.

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

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH, Madam 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. JAMES E. RISCH,
*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. 19-30, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$670 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. 19-30

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 India.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * \$0 million.
Other \$670 million.
Total \$670 million.

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

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: C-17 follow-on support includes spares and repair parts; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; support and test equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force IN-D-QAC.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: IN-D-SAC, IN-D-SAE.

(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: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 26, 2019.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

India—C-17 Sustainment Follow-On Support

The Government of India has requested to buy equipment for C-17 follow-on support, to include spares and repair parts; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; support and test equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$670 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to strengthen the U.S.-Indian strategic relationship and to improve the mobility capabilities of a major defensive partner which continues to be an important force for political stability, peace, and economic progress in the Inda-Pacific and South Asia region.

India needs this follow-on support to maintain its operational readiness and ability to provide Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HA/DR) assistance in the region. India will have no difficulty absorbing this support into its armed forces.

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

The prime contractor will be the Boeing Corporation, Chicago, Illinois. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale, however, the purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the prime contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of one U.S. Government representative and 23 contractor representatives to India.

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

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Madam 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. JAMES E. RISCH,
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. 19-48 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$950 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. 19-48

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: Republic of Korea.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$0 million.
Other \$950 million.
Total \$950 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Republic of Korea has requested to purchase items and services for follow-on support to the RQ-4 Block 30 Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA) program.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.
Non-MDE: Contractor Logistics Support

(CLS); program management; training for pilots maintenance, logistics and communications personnel; depot and organizational level maintenance; minor modifications and upgrades; spares and repair/return parts; operational flight support; program analysis; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistical services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (KS-D-QFU).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: KS-D-SAD.
(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: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 29, 2019.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Republic of Korea—Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) for RQ-4 Block 30 Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA)

The Republic of Korea has requested to purchase Contractor Logistics Support

(CLS); program management; training for pilots maintenance, logistics and communications personnel; depot and organizational level maintenance; minor modifications and upgrades; spares and repair/return parts; operational flight support; program analysis; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistical services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$950 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by meeting the legitimate security and defense needs of one of the closest allies in the INDOPACOM Theater. The Republic of Korea is one of the major political and economic powers in East Asia and the Western Pacific and a key partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability in that region. It is vital to U.S. national interests to assist the Republic of Korea in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

This proposed sale will enable the Republic of Korea to sustain and operate its fleet of RQ-4 Block 30 remotely piloted aircraft and will significantly advance U.S. interests in standardization with the Republic of Korea's Armed Forces. The potential sale will further strengthen the interoperability between the United States and the Republic of Korea and ensures the Alliance has a robust intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability on the Korean peninsula. The ROK will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

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

The principal contractor will be Northrop Grumman Corporation located in Palmdale, CA. There are no known offset agreements proposed in conjunction with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the Purchaser and the prime contractor.

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

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

All defense articles and services in this transmittal have been approved for release and export to the Republic of Korea.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Madam 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. JAMES E. RISCH,
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. 19-29 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Pakistan for defense services estimated to cost \$125 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. 19-29

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 Pakistan.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$0 million.

Other \$125 million.

Total \$125 million.

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

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: Continuation of technical support services; U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support to assist in the oversight of operations in support of the Pakistan Peace Drive advanced F-16 program.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (PK-D-GAI).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: PK-D-GAC, PK-D-GAF.

(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: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 26, 2019.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Pakistan—Technical Security Team (TST) in Continued Support of the F-16 Program

The Government of Pakistan requested a continuation of technical support services; U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support to assist in the oversight of operations in support of the Pakistan Peace Drive advanced F-16 program. The total estimated program cost is \$125 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by protecting U.S. technology through the continued presence of U.S. personnel that provide 24/7 end-use monitoring. Congress required 24/7 monitoring of the advanced F-16s and AMRAAMs in the original LOA, which is carried out by the Technical Security Teams (TST) at Shahbaz and Mushaf Air Force bases. The TST exists to protect sensitive U.S. technology through 24/7 observation and reporting. TST members are not authorized to train Pakistan Air Force (PAF) service members or perform maintenance on PAF aircraft.

The proposed sale of this support will not alter the basic military balance in the region. The principal contractor is Booz Allen Hamilton Engineering Services LLC, Fairborn, Ohio.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of 60 contractor representatives to Pakistan to assist in the oversight of operations as part of the Peace Drive F-16 program.

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

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH, Madam 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. JAMES E. RISCH,
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. 19-33 concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Thailand for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$175 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,

GREGORY M. KAUSNER,
(for Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant
General, USA, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-33

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 Thailand.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$125 million.

Other \$50 million.

Total \$175 million.

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

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Sixty (60) Stryker Infantry Carrier Vehicles (ICV).

Sixty (60) M2 Flex .50 Cal Machine Guns.

Non-MDE: Also included are spare parts, Basic Issue Items (BII), Components of End Items (COEI), Additional Authorized List (AAL), Special Tools and Test Equipment (STTE), technical manuals, OCONUS Deprocessing Service, M6 smoke grenade launchers (4 per vehicle) and associated spares, AN/VAS-5 Driver's Vision Enhancer

(DVE), AN/VIC-3 vehicle intercommunications system, contractor provided training and Field Service Representatives (FSR), and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (TH-B-WGX).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(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 Annex Attached.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 26, 2019.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Thailand—Stryker Infantry Carrier Vehicles

The Government of Thailand has requested to buy sixty (60) Stryker Infantry Carrier Vehicles (ICV); and sixty (60) M2 Flex .50 cal machine guns. Also included are spare parts, Basic Issue Items (BII), Components of End Items (COEI), Additional Authorized List (AAL) (specific items for operations and maintenance), Special Tools and Test Equipment (STTE), technical manuals, OCONUS Deprocessing Service, M6 smoke grenade launchers (4 per vehicle) and associated spares, AN/VAS-5 Driver's Vision Enhancer (DVE), AN/VIC-3 vehicle intercommunications system, contractor provided training and Field Service Representatives (FSR), and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$175 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve security of a Major Non-NATO ally in INDO-PACOM which is an important force for political stability and economic progress in the region.

The Stryker vehicles will increase Thailand's capability to defend its sovereign territory against traditional and non-traditional threats by filling the capability void between light infantry soldiers and heavy mechanized units. Thailand will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

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

The principal contractor for the Stryker vehicle is General Dynamics Land Systems, Sterling Heights, MI. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any permanent additional U.S. Government or Contractor representatives to Thailand.

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

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-33

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 M1126 Stryker is an infantry carrier vehicle transporting nine soldiers, their mission equipment and a crew of two consisting of a driver and vehicle commander. It is equipped with armor protection, M2 machine guns and M6 Smoke Grenade Launchers for self-protection. The Stryker is an eight-wheeled vehicle powered by a 350hp diesel engine. It incorporates a central tire inflation system, run-flat tires, and a vehicle height management system. The Stryker is capable of supporting a communications suite, a Global Positioning System (GPS), and a high

frequency and near-term digital radio systems. The Stryker is deployable by C-130 aircraft and combat capable upon arrival. The Stryker is capable of self-deployment by highway and self-recovery. It has a low noise level that reduces crew fatigue and enhances survivability. It moves about the battlefield quickly and is optimized for close, complex, or urban terrain. The Stryker program leverages nondevelopmental items with common subsystems and components to quickly acquire and field these systems. Stryker is UNCLASSIFIED.

2. The AN/VAS-5 Driver's Vision Enhancer (DVE) is a compact thermal camera providing armored vehicle drivers with day or night time visual awareness in clear or reduced vision (fog, smoke, dust) situation. The system provides the driver a 180 degree viewing angle using a high resolution infrared sensor and image stabilization to reduce the effect of shock and vibration. The viewer and monitor are ruggedized for operation in tactical environments. The system is UNCLASSIFIED but considered SENSITIVE technology.

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 Thailand can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale supports the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives as outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Thailand.

NOMINATION OF DANIEL HABIB JORJANI

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, today I wish to give notice of my intent to object to any unanimous consent agreement regarding Senate Executive Calendar No. 367, the nomination of Daniel Jorjani to be Solicitor at the Department of the Interior.

Recently released documents reveal that, during Mr. Jorjani's confirmation hearing before the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, he knowingly gave misleading and untruthful testimony about the Department's Freedom of Information Act—FOIA—policy.

Department officials appear to have created a policy with regard to the Freedom of Information Act allowing political appointees to delay and thwart the release of information to the public. Worse still, when I asked Mr. Jorjani about this policy, he told me it didn't exist.

Attempts by political appointees at the Department to delay, stonewall, and otherwise inhibit public and congressional oversight are completely unacceptable. This sort of rank political interference with government accountability runs contrary to the very basis of our form of government.

On February 28, 2019, the Department issued an updated version of its formal "Awareness Review" policy, which outlines the Department's review process

for FOIA document productions. However, based on documents obtained through multiple FOIA requests, it appears the Department has a supplemental process for document productions that has not previously been made public.

Mr. Jorjani appeared before the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on May 2, 2019, for his confirmation hearing to serve as the Department's Solicitor. During Mr. Jorjani's hearing and in written testimony he provided the Committee shortly thereafter, he told me this supplemental awareness review process did not exist.

Currently, the Department's inspector general is conducting a review of Interior's FOIA policies. In addition, I have asked the U.S. Department of Justice to look into whether Mr. Jorjani perjured himself before the committee.

I cannot condone the movement of Mr. Jorjani's nomination. Therefore, I will object to any unanimous consent agreement to consider Mr. Jorjani's nomination.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, I was necessarily absent for vote No. 231 on overriding the veto, shall the Joint Resolution S.J. Res. 36 pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. On vote No. 231, had I been present, I would have voted yea to override the veto.

I was also necessarily absent for vote No. 232 on overriding the veto, shall the Joint Resolution S.J. Res. 37 pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. On vote No. 232, had I been present, I would have voted yea to override the veto.

I was also necessarily absent for vote No. 233 on overriding the veto, shall the joint resolution S.J. Res. 38 pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. On vote No. 233, had I been present, I would have voted yea to override the veto.

I was also necessarily absent for vote No. 234 on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Michael T. Liburdi to be a U.S. District Judge for the District of Arizona. On vote No. 234, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture.

I was also necessarily absent for vote No. 235 on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Peter D. Welte to be U.S. District Judge for the District of North Dakota. On vote No. 235, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MADAWASKA, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the 150th

anniversary of the Town of Madawaska ME. Located in Aroostook County, our State's northernmost region, Madawaska is in the heart of the St. John River Valley, the center of our rich Acadian culture. I am honored to celebrate the generations of industrious and caring people who have made Madawaska such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

Madawaska has a fascinating history. For thousands of years, the St. John River Valley has been the home of the Maliseet Tribe. French explorers, led by Samuel de Champlain, first visited the area in 1604 and established friendly relationships with the Native Americans.

In 1785, French-speaking Canadians fleeing persecution in British Canada journeyed up the St. John River in search of liberty. They marked the spot of their landing with a large wooden cross in gratitude for the safe haven they had found. Today, the rebuilt Acadian Cross is an enduring reminder of the determination and courage of those first settlers. The Tante Blanche Museum honors the heroism and compassion of Marguerite Blanche Thibodeau Cyr, who fed the hungry and cared for the sick during a famine in 1797.

The Maliseets often provided vital assistance during the first difficult years. From fertile soil, vast forests, and their own hard work, the settlers created a prosperous community that laid the foundation for the vibrant Acadian culture that is so important in Maine, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and as far away as Louisiana.

Following the American Revolution, the region was the scene of a decades-long border dispute between our new Nation and British Canada. Although the bloodless Aroostook War did not result in armed conflict, it was a period of great tension and uncertainty, with both sides seeking control of the increasingly valuable timberlands. As the national governments of Great Britain and the United States negotiated a peaceful resolution, the province of New Brunswick laid claim to the disputed area. On July 4, 1827, a band of pro-American settlers declared the independence of the Republic of Madawaska with its own flag and the intention of joining the United States.

In response, the Maine Legislature established the Territory of Madawaska in 1831, creating what was called the world's biggest town, with an area of more than 4,000 square miles. The border dispute was settled by treaty in 1842. Peace was maintained between the United States and Canada. Settlement to the region increase greatly, and in 1869, the town of Madawaska was incorporated.

Today, more than 80 percent of the town's residents speak French, and they continue to uphold the Acadian traditions of great food, music, and dance, and of close-knit families and lasting friendships. The annual Acadian Festival in August is a highlight of the year and a fulfilled celebration of this great heritage.

To my Franco-American friends, it is a pleasure to congratulate you on this landmark anniversary. Across the generations, you have worked hard and worked together to create a community that combines your rich heritage with the values that define our State and our Nation.

Mr. President, the celebration of Madawaska's 150th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time, it is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LARRY ROBERTSON

• Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize my friend Larry Robertson, a dedicated servant to the great people of West Virginia. After 20 years, Larry will be retiring from his post as executive director of HospiceCare, in my hometown of Charleston, WV. As a lifelong residence of the State capital city, Larry dedicated his career to caring for those in his area. He hasn't moved around much, with his office only a mile or two down the road from the fill station his father worked at when he was just a boy.

After graduating from George Washington High School, Larry stuck around the Kanawha River Valley and enrolled in Morris Harvey College, which is now known as the University of Charleston. With his bachelor's degree complete and after earning a master's in accounting from the West Virginia College of Graduate Studies in 1976, he set his sights on ways to give back to the community that had already given him so much. This commitment led Larry to take a job as a controller for the Blue Cross Medical Plan in Charleston.

From this point on, Larry would spend the entirety of his professional life committed to providing financial support and administrative services to not-for-profit organizations in the healthcare field. In the past 20 years, HospiceCare has flourished under Larry's leadership, providing over 300 jobs and services to 16 counties in West Virginia. Larry and HospiceCare also provide the community with an avenue to give back to those in need, garnering hundreds of volunteers throughout the years. There is an old saying that says there is nothing stronger than the heart of a volunteer, but I believe Larry's "Hospice Heart" is even stronger.

Larry has also been instrumental in the foundation and the success of West Virginia's first inpatient hospice center, the Hubbard Hospice House. This project started out with only enough space and staff to accommodate 12 residents, but has grown exponentially under the vision of Larry and his dedicated team. By the end of this year, the Hubbard Hospice House operation

will be able to house 56 beds in several locations across central West Virginia. I became familiar with hospice during the last stage of my parents' lives. The support and dedication they give to their patients is a wonderful lifeline for families and caregivers. I am incredibly indebted to Larry and his staff for their professional services. Hundreds of families in Kanawha County and the surrounding area feel the same and share the same appreciation for the care hospice gave their family members. Thank you, Larry, for your dedication to building such a quality healthcare provider for end of life care that is so highly regarded throughout the State and region.

Larry will now have more time to spend with his grandchildren, watch the West Virginia Mountaineers, and work on his golf game, but the lasting effects for what he did for our State will continue on for generations to come. I wish Larry all the best in his retirement, as he continues to make a difference in his community with his one-of-a-kind attitude and generous heart. It is truly an honor to call you friend and fellow West Virginian.●

RECOGNIZING CAREY, IDAHO

• Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES RISCH and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, I congratulate the city of Carey, ID, on its centennial anniversary.

In 1884, just a few years after the first settlers arrived in the area, a school was built next to James Carey's Post Office. Homes, roads, and churches soon joined the landscape, demonstrating early on the characteristics that are readily associated with Carey today: selflessness, hard work, and determination to make their slice of Idaho neighborly and productive. By the time the residents of Carey got around to incorporating the town in 1919, a sense of community was already deeply rooted.

On July 20, 2019, the city of Carey celebrated its 100-year anniversary of its establishment with special events, including a parade, music, rodeo, and other activities. This picturesque community in Blaine County, ID, is in a beautiful area rich in history and extraordinary people. The area has a deep legacy of sheep herding and cattle ranching and has been home to remarkable Idahoans, including pioneers, ranchers, producers, conservationists, writers, and leaders. Among them was the late, former Idaho secretary of state Pete Cenarrusa, a beloved public servant and veteran, who ran a successful sheep operation with his wife of 66 years, Freda.

Pete is Carey's most famous son. In Idaho, Pete's legendary achievements are well known. He was a member of the 1940 University of Idaho NCAA national champion boxing team, served as a World War II fighter pilot, and he holds the record for Idaho's longest serving elected official at 52 years. One

validating experience exemplifying Pete's political will and influence occurred in 1948 when he convinced President Harry Truman to visit his hometown of Carey and dedicate the Carey Airport, which, according to some accounts, was built in a single day—a story that is reflective of a proud and dedicated public servant and committed townspeople. Pete Cenarrusa and Carey, ID, are synonymous among most in Idaho, each possessing their own distinct legacy, despite being deeply-entwined, that has contributed mightily to our State's history and success.

The residents of Carey have much to celebrate. In addition to building a welcoming community settled in an amazing part of our great State, recreational opportunities abound, including skiing, fishing, hiking, biking, and hunting. Past and present-day Carey residents have developed Carey into a community built on a foundation of resourcefulness and good will with an eye toward how to further grow and make progress for the betterment of its residents.

Congratulations to the residents of Carey on 100 years of accomplishments, principal among them building a lovely town where people can live full lives. If this is a suitable, primary measure of a successful community, you have more than succeeded. We wish you well for centuries to come.●

RECOGNIZING THE GREENBRIER MIDDLE SCHOOL STEM COMPETITION TEAM

• Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the members of the Greenbrier Middle School STEM Competition Team from Evans, GA: Jordan Epstein, Emily Forshee, Kendall Schneller, Carissa Veriato, and Sam Weinstein, as well as their teacher, Mr. David Phillips.

Last October, the team competed in the STEAM competition at Augusta University. The team designed, built, and launched a rocket that was powered by water pressure and carrying a chicken egg. The rocket successfully landed in the landing zone that was only 30 feet in diameter.

The team won grand prize in that competition for middle school engineering, and received an invitation to the International Young STEM Maker Competition at Lingnan University in Hong Kong. They were the only American team to have received an invite.

The team worked to design a house that was powered by water as well as a new concept for electric vehicles. Out of 111 teams from around the globe, Greenbrier was awarded second place for their work. On top of that, the team's faculty leader, Mr. David Phillips, was awarded second place in the Best STEM Teacher competition.

These bright young people and the teachers who guide them have made the State of Georgia and all of America very proud. Please join me in congratulating Mr. Phillips and all members of

the Greenbrier Middle School STEM Competition Team for their incredible achievements. Thank you.●

RECOGNIZING EMPIRE AIRLINES

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho's entrepreneurs are passionate individuals who consistently innovate and provide high-quality products and services. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my distinct privilege to recognize Empire Airlines as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for August 2019. Located in Hayden, Empire Airlines is an international air carrier and heavy maintenance repair station with decades of experience and a history of success.

In 1977, Nick Chenoweth and Vic Walters founded Clearwater Flying Service, which later became Empire Airlines. Neither Chenoweth nor Walters were pilots, nor had they any experience running an airline. A third partner, Mel Spelde, joined the company just 2 months later as flight instructor and manager. Early jobs for the business included fire patrol, air ambulance, charters, flight instruction, transporting backcountry hunters and anglers, and cloud seeding in Libya. The business quickly adopted a "go anywhere, do anything" attitude, which is reflected in its motto, "We Can Do That." As the business grew, they eventually changed the name to Empire Airlines. Now run by president and CEO, Tim Komberec, Empire Airlines focuses on cargo, maintenance, and airline startups.

Over the years, Empire steadily grew but never lost the try-anything, go-anywhere spirit embodied in its motto. Empire now has an aerospace division to provide state-of-the-art maintenance for aircraft, as well as an unmanned division, which provides drone services to help clients solve problems and reach goals. Empire Airlines also provides consulting services to help others jump-start their airline operation.

Empire Airlines strives to be a valued member of the community, supporting various charities and causes, including drug-free high school graduation parties in the area and numerous other events. What might be most impressive is the way Empire celebrates the many employees who have reached 25 years with the company by giving them a place in the timeline of the company's history posted publicly on its website.

Empire Airlines' success is a prime example of Idaho's entrepreneurial spirit: Dare to dream, look at things differently, never give up, and when opportunity calls, answer with "We can do that." The State of Idaho is proud to be home to innovative, hard-working entrepreneurs like Nick, Vic, Mel, and all of those at Empire Airlines. The entire Empire family shows how one big idea and a dedication to hard

work can lead to small business success. I would like to congratulate Tim Komberec and all of the employees at Empire Airlines on being named the "Idaho Small Business of the Month" for August 2019. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

TRIBUTE TO BETH ANNE MALONEY

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I would like to recognize Ms. Beth Anne Maloney of Hampton, NH, and celebrate her well-deserved retirement after 31 years of service to the students in that community as a school nurse.

After beginning her nursing career in 1984, Beth joined the staff of Centre Elementary School in Hampton in the fall of 1988. Centre School serves roughly 350 prekindergarten through grade 2 students and has the distinction of being the oldest public school in the State of New Hampshire. Beth was the school's first full-time registered nurse, and she has overseen the modernizing of the school's health services.

Over the years, Beth connected with thousands of students while carrying out her daily duties of assessing health, conducting vision and hearing screenings, and acting as a first responder. She developed particularly close relationships with students who had chronic conditions that required specialized care and management, including epilepsy, allergies, and asthma. Over time, she gained significant experience assisting students with type 1 diabetes, who often require daily nursing assistance with their diet, blood sugar monitoring, and medication. Beth was actively engaged in developing care plans for these students that would minimize interruptions to their daily schedules, and she continually trained her fellow staff members to prevent and respond to diabetic emergencies.

In addition to her nursing duties, Beth was a tireless advocate for students in need of health-related services, which could range from immunizations or a new pair of glasses to specialized care for untreated conditions. She maintained numerous relationships with seacoast area health providers willing to help the families of students in need. Beth also took on a number of charitable causes and frequently organized the school's annual Thanksgiving food drive in partnership with the local St. Vincent de Paul Society.

I thank Beth for her dedication to keeping our young people healthy and her service to the students, parents, and staff, who make up the Centre School community. I know these values will continue to guide her future endeavors. Please join me in honoring an outstanding Granite Stater, Beth Maloney.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:44 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RASKIN) has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 2249. An act to allow the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on the date of enactment of this Act to continue to serve as such Deputy Administrator.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 30, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2249. An act to allow the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on the date of enactment of this Act to continue to serve as such Deputy Administrator.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Finance: Brian McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Andrew K. Maloney

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2141. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances" (FRL No. 9994-72-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2142. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Optimizing Surface Naval Vessel Inspections and Crew Certifications"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2143. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Mali; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2144. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to the Congress on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2145. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Joint Ownership Deposit Accounts" (RIN3064-AF04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2146. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests In, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds" (RIN3064-AE88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2147. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Simplifications to the Capital Rule Pursuant to the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996" (RIN3064-AE59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2148. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Interstate Transport (Prongs 1 and 2) for the 2010 1-Hour NO₂ Standard" (FRL No. 9997-40-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2149. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Maine; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9996-99-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2150. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; TN; Updates to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Chattanooga" (FRL No. 9997-38-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2151. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Title V Operation Permit Program" (FRL No. 9997-36-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2152. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma" (FRL No. 9996-93-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2153. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Redesignation of the Missouri Portion of the St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL 2012 PM_{2.5} Unclassifiable Area" (FRL No. 9996-08-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2154. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Business Data Services in an Internet Protocol Environment, et al." ((WC Docket Nos. 18-141, 16-143, and 05-25) (FCC 19-66)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2155. A communication from the Trial Attorney, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalties" (RIN2127-AL94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-123. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri calling on the President of the United States to undertake a full and transparent investigation by the United States Department of State into organ transplant practices in the People's Republic of China, and to call for the prosecution of those found to have engaged in such unethical practices; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, extensive and credible reports have revealed mass killing of prisoners of conscience in the People's Republic of China, primarily practitioners of the spiritual based exercises of Falun Gong, but also other religious and ethnic minority groups, in order to obtain organs for transplants; and

Whereas, the organ transplantation system in China does not comply with the World Health Organization's Guiding Principles of traceability and transparency in organ procurement pathways, and the government of the People's Republic of China has resisted independent scrutiny of the system; and

Whereas, traditional Chinese custom requires bodies to be preserved intact after death. With rare voluntary organ donation, however, China's transplantation industry significantly increased since 2000; and

Whereas, the 2017 Freedom House Report "The Battle for China's Spirit" slates that "Available evidence suggests that forced extraction of organs from Falun Gong detainees for sale in transplant operations has occurred on a large scale and may be continuing"; and

Whereas, an investigative report, published in June 2016, conducted by human rights attorney David Matas, former Canadian Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific David Kilgour, and journalist Ethan Gutmann, estimated that China is performing 60,000 to 100,000 transplants per year as opposed to 10,000 transplants claimed by the Chinese

government, which is "an industrial-scale, state-directed organ transplantation system, controlled through national policies and funding, and implicating both the military and civilian healthcare systems"; and

Whereas, China's Liver Transplant Registry System indicated that more than 25% of cases were emergency transplants, for which an organ was found within days or even hours. Wait times for non-emergency liver transplants were usually quoted in weeks. Most patients in other countries have to wait years for a transplant; and

Whereas, the Chinese government claims that 90% of China's organ transplant sources come from executed prisoners. However, the number of executions has dropped 10% annually since 2002 and is far less than the number of transplants taking place. The government has never acknowledged the sourcing of organs from prisoners of conscience; and

Whereas, Falun Gong, a spiritual practice involving meditative "qigong" exercises and centered on the values of truthfulness, compassion, and forbearance, became immensely popular in China in the 1990s, with multiple estimates placing the number of practitioners at upwards of 70 million; and

Whereas, in July 1999, the Chinese Communist Party launched an intensive, nationwide persecution designed to eradicate the spiritual practice of Falun Gong, including physical and mental torture, reflecting the party's long-standing intolerance or large independent civil society groups; and

Whereas, since 1999, hundreds of thousands of Falun Gong practitioners have been detained extra-legally in Chinese reeducation-through-labor camps, detention centers, and prisons, where torture, abuse, and implausible medical exams and blood tests on Falun Gong practitioners are routine; and

Whereas, Freedom House reported in 2015 that Falun Gong practitioners comprise the largest portion of prisoners of conscience in China, and face an elevated risk of dying or being killed in custody; and

Whereas, the United Nations Committee Against Torture and the Special Rapporteur on Torture have expressed concern over the allegations of organ harvesting from Falun Gong prisoners, and have called on the Government of the People's Republic of China to increase accountability and transparency in the organ transplant system and punish those responsible for abuses; and

Whereas, in June 2016, the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously passed House Resolution 343, condemning the systematic, state-sanctioned organ harvesting from Falun Gong and other prisoners of conscience; and

Whereas, the killing of religious or political prisoners for the purpose of selling their organs for transplant is an egregious and intolerable violation of the fundamental right to live; and

Whereas, organ tourism to China should not be shielded by medical confidentiality, but openly monitored. No nation should allow their citizens to go to China for organs until China has allowed a full investigation into organ harvesting of prisoners of conscience, both past and present: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Missouri Senate, One-Hundredth General Assembly, First Regular Session, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

(1) Call upon the Government or the People's Republic of China to immediately end the practice of organ harvesting from all prisoners and prisoners of conscience, and explicitly from Falun Gong prisoners or conscience and members of other religious and ethnic minority groups;

(2) Call upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately end

the 17-year persecution of the Falun Gong, and the immediate release of all Falun Gong practitioners and other prisoners of conscience;

(3) Call upon the President of the United States to undertake a full and transparent investigation by the United States Department of State into organ transplant practices in the People's Republic of China, and calls for the prosecution of those found to have engaged in such unethical practices;

(4) Encourage the medical community of Missouri to engage in educating colleagues and residents of Missouri about the risks of travel to China for organ transplants so as to help prevent Missouri residents from unwittingly becoming involved in murder in the form of forced organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience; and

(5) Agree to take measures to ban the entry of those who have participated in illegal removal of human tissues and organs, and seek prosecution of such individuals should they be found on the soil of Missouri; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Missouri Senate be instructed to prepare properly inscribed copies of this resolution for the President and Vice President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the chair of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, the chair of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, and each member of Missouri's Congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 398. A bill to support the peaceful resolution of the civil war in Yemen, to address the resulting humanitarian crisis, and to hold the perpetrators responsible for murdering a Saudi dissident.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Sharon Fast Gustafson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of four years.

*Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2023.

*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. MERKLEY:

S. 2312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a surtax on corporations with significant disparities in employee wages; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 2313. A bill to authorize 2 additional district judgeships for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 2314. A bill to prohibit social media companies from using practices that exploit human psychology or brain physiology to substantially impede freedom of choice, to require social media companies to take measures to mitigate the risks of internet addiction and psychological exploitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2315. A bill to amend section 4712 of title 41, United States Code, to clarify the inclusion of subcontractors and subgrantees for whistleblower protection; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2316. A bill to require a plan for strengthening the supply chain intelligence function, to establish a National Supply Chain Intelligence Center, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2317. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to credit individuals serving as caregivers of dependent relatives with deemed wages for up to five years of such service, and to support State medical training programs for caregivers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2318. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a continuous diagnostics and mitigation program in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2319. A bill to allow the Coast Guard to consider the impacts of Hurricane Michael for the purpose of modifying contracts for offshore patrol cutters; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2320. A bill to make improvements to the conduct of United States foreign policy through a change in the supervision of the Peace Corps and transferring it from the status of "independent agency" to a subordinate agency within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2321. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2322. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the retirement of certain animals used in Federal research; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2323. A bill to require the screening of 100 percent of international mail and express cargo inbound into the United States from high-risk countries to detect and prevent the importation of illicit fentanyl and other il-

licit synthetic opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2324. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to encourage women members of the Armed Forces who separate or retire from the Armed Forces during fiscal year 2020 to participate in the Women's Health Transition Training Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2325. A bill to establish a task force to review policies and measures to promote, and to develop best practices for, reduction of short-lived climate pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2326. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for expedited coding and coverage of novel medical products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2327. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the eligibility requirements for transfer of unused entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 2328. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs authority to enter into agreements for the planning, design, and construction, or leasing, of facilities to be operated as shared medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2329. A bill to provide for the acquisition of non-Federal land for inclusion in the Fort Monroe National Monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2330. A bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide for congressional oversight of the board of directors of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee and to protect amateur athletes from emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2331. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify the availability and appropriateness of training for local food service personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2332. A bill to provide for the modernization of the electric grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 2333. A bill to provide for enhanced energy grid security; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2334. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish the 21st Century Energy Workforce Advisory Board, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2335. A bill to accelerate smart building development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2336. A bill to improve the management of information technology projects and investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2337. A bill to establish requirements for quality and discard dates that are, at the option of food labelers, included in food packaging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2338. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from financing the export of nuclear technology, equipment, fuel, materials, or other goods or services to Saudi Arabia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2339. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for accreditation reform, to require institutions of higher education to publish information regarding student success, to provide for fiscal accountability, and to provide for school accountability for student loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2340. A bill to establish the Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historical Park in the States of Illinois and Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2341. A bill to establish protections for passengers in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 2342. A bill to provide for requirements for data brokers with respect to the acquisition, use, and protection of brokered personal information and to require that data brokers annually register with the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2343. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to permit Governors of States to regulate intrastate endangered species and intrastate threatened species, to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to permit the taking of certain black vultures and ravens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 2344. A bill to establish a broadband infrastructure finance and innovation program to make available loans, loan guarantees, and lines of credit for the construction and deployment of broadband infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2345. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to pay for pre-

paratory courses for professional licenses and certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2346. A bill to improve the Fishery Resource Disaster Relief program of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. SINEMA):

S.J. Res. 51. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 291. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federation Internationale de Football Association should immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and treat all athletes with the same respect and dignity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 292. A resolution calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed separatist groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue an inclusive dialogue to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 293. A resolution designating September 25, 2019, as "National Lobster Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 63

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from

Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 63, a bill to implement the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform.

S. 110

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 110, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the lower income threshold for the medical expense deduction.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 176

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 176, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on estates, gifts, and generation-skipping transfers.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 340

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 340, a bill to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.

S. 402

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 402, a bill to plan, develop, and make recommendations to increase access to sexual assault examinations for survivors by holding hospitals accountable and supporting the providers that serve them.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 427, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism spectrum disorder and enhance programs relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 430

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 430, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 433

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill clarifying that it is United States policy to recognize Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 754

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 754, a bill to encourage partnerships among public agencies and other interested parties to promote fish conservation, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 895

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 895, a bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals.

S. 978

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the work opportunity credit.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1007, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1203

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), and the Sen-

ator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1203, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes.

S. 1209

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1209, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications.

S. 1236

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1236, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to clarify the composition of the membership of the Municipal Securities Rule-making Board, and for other purposes.

S. 1253

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1253, a bill to apply requirements relating to delivery sales of cigarettes to delivery sales of electronic nicotine delivery systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1263

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1263, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an interagency task force on the use of public lands to provide medical treatment and therapy to veterans through outdoor recreation.

S. 1279

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1279, a bill to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions.

S. 1341

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1341, a bill to adopt a certain California flammability standard as a Federal flammability standard to protect against the risk of upholstered furniture flammability, and for other purposes.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1408, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to improve child care protections provided through interstate background checks.

S. 1424

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1424, a bill to promote affordable access to evidence-based

opioid treatments under the Medicare program and require coverage of medication assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, opioid overdose reversal medications, and recovery support services by health plans without cost-sharing requirements.

S. 1620

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1620, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes.

S. 1703

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1715

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1715, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to all Gold Star Families in recognition of their sacrifice and service to the United States.

S. 1750

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1750, a bill to establish the Clean School Bus Grant Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1784

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1784, a bill to provide for the issuance of a Stamp Out Elder Abuse Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2022

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2022, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2023

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2023, a bill to modify the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2025

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2025, a bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify the definition of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

S. 2032

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2032, a bill to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana.

S. 2059

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2059, a bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes.

S. 2064

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2064, a bill to direct the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to consolidate the Case Management/Electronic Case Files system, and for other purposes.

S. 2080

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2080, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 2100

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2100, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a small business start-up tax credit for veterans creating businesses in underserved communities.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2103, a bill to improve access to affordable insulin.

S. 2108

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2108, a bill to amend section 6903 of title 31, United States Code, to provide for additional population tiers, and for other purposes.

S. 2147

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2147, a bill to double the existing penalties for the provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and to extend the statute of limitations for forfeiture

penalties for persons who commit such violations.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2179, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2238

At the request of Mr. BROWN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2238, a bill to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2238, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2238, *supra*.

S. 2242

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2242, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Presidential campaigns to detect and report such acts.

S. 2245

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2245, a bill to cap non-interest Federal Spending as a percentage of potential GDP to right-size the government, grow the economy, and balance the budget.

S. 2258

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2258, a bill to provide anti-retaliation protections for anti-trust whistleblowers.

S. 2261

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2261, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Clean Energy Victory Bonds.

S. 2289

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2289, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an extension of the energy credit and the credit for residential energy efficient property.

S. 2291

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2291, a bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum standards of visitability for persons with disabilities.

S. 2293

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2293, a bill to extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States and to modify the quorum requirement of the Bank, and for other purposes.

S. 2300

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2300, a bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to establish a program to incentivize innovation and to enhance the industrial competitiveness of the United States by developing technologies to reduce emissions of nonpower industrial sectors, and for other purposes.

S. 2302

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2302, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2310

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2310, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a competitive grant program to repair, improve, rehabilitate, or replace bridges to improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the movement of people and freight over bridge crossings, and for other purposes.

S. J. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 13, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr.

BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 252, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2322. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the retirement of certain animals used in Federal research; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Michigan, Senator PETERS, in introducing the Animal Freedom from Testing, Experiments, and Research Act, known as the AFTER Act, to promote the adoption or retirement of animals used for research at Federal agencies. I would also like to thank Senators SHAHEEN and MCSALLY who are original cosponsors of this legislation.

In fiscal year 2018, the Federal government experimented on approximately 50,000 animals for research purposes. The experiments occurred across twelve different Federal agencies and the animals used were mainly cats, dogs, monkeys, and rabbits. While tracking these animals following experimentation is challenging, once animals are no longer needed for research, they are often killed, since many agencies lack formal retirement or adoption policies. With that said, recent studies indicate that research animals who are adopted often thrive in their new environments.

In 2013, led by Senators HARKIN, ALEXANDER, CANTWELL and myself, the Senate passed the CHIMP Act, which allowed for the retirement of hundreds of primates that were formerly being used in National Institute of Health (NIH) experiments. In addition, the Departments of Defense, Veteran Affairs, and NIH recently enacted successful animal retirement policies. While I am encouraged by the Senate's past work on primates and the recent policies developed by a few agencies; there are still many Federal agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, NASA, the Environmental Protection Agency that lack formal policies for animals that have been used in experiments.

The AFTER Act builds on successful policies at DOD, VA, and NIH by directing all Federal agencies to promulgate regulations that would facilitate the retirement of laboratory animals. The bill provides flexibility for each agency to devise its own policy, with the goal of ensuring that such animals, whenever possible, are retired and not

killed. Additionally, the AFTER Act requires animals to be evaluated by a licensed veterinarian and pronounced both mentally and physically healthy before leaving an agency. This will help ensure a smooth transition to a new environment.

Our legislation also encourages Federal agencies to work with non-profit organizations to ensure retired animals are distributed to sanctuaries and shelters across the Nation, not just those closest to the research facility. This would allow a State like Maine, which does not have Federal research labs that use animals, to play a role in retiring these animals and providing homes for them.

Mr. President, there is no reason animals that are suitable for adoption or retirement should be killed by our Federal government. The AFTER Act would provide the necessary direction Federal agencies need in order to move forward with developing retirement policies. I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this important bipartisan legislation, the Animal Freedom from Testing, Experiments, and Research Act.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2340. A bill to establish the Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historical Park in the States of Illinois and Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2340

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historical Park Act".

SEC. 2. CAHOKIA MOUNDS MISSISSIPPIAN CULTURE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, ILLINOIS AND MISSOURI.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term "historical park" means the Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historical Park established by subsection (b).

(2) MAP.—The term "map" means the map entitled "Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historical Park, Boundary", numbered CMMC-NHP-107, and dated 05-31-2019.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATES.—The term "States" means the States of Illinois and Missouri.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), in order to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of the Mississippian Culture, there is established, as a unit of the National Park System, the Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historical Park in—

(A) Collinsville, Illinois;

(B) Monroe, Madison, and St. Clair Counties, Illinois; and

(C) St. Louis City County, Missouri.

(2) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired in accordance with subsection (d) to constitute a manageable unit.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) BOUNDARY.—The boundary of the historical park shall be the boundary as depicted on the map.

(d) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the boundary of the historical park by—

(A) donation;

(B) purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds; or

(C) exchange.

(2) LIMITATION.—Any land owned by the States or a political subdivision of 1 of the States may be acquired only by donation.

(3) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary acquires sufficient land under this subsection to achieve compliance with subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of the establishment of the historical park.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) sections 100101(a), 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(ii) chapters 1003 and 3201 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the States and political subdivisions of the States, institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, Indian Tribes, and individuals—

(i) to identify, interpret, and restore nationally significant historical or cultural and natural resources relating to the life of the Mississippian Culture within the boundaries of the historical park, subject to the condition that such an agreement shall provide for reasonable public access; and

(ii) to conduct research relating to the Mississippian Culture.

(B) COST-SHARING.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall be not more than 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity under this paragraph may be in the form of—

(I) in-kind contributions; or

(II) goods or services fairly valued.

(f) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the general management plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) the States and appropriate political subdivisions of the States;

(B) institutions of higher education;

(C) nonprofit organizations;

(D) Indian Tribes; and

(E) other affected individuals and entities, including—

(i) the Illinois Department of Natural Resources;

(ii) the Osage Tribe; and

(iii) the Heartlands Conservancy.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 291—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION SHOULD IMMEDIATELY ELIMINATE GENDER PAY INEQUITY AND TREAT ALL ATHLETES WITH THE SAME RESPECT AND DIGNITY

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 291

Whereas the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (referred to in this preamble as “FIFA”) awarded \$400,000,000 to the 32 teams that competed in the 2018 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$30,000,000 to the 24 teams that competed in the 2019 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$38,000,000 to the team that won the 2018 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$4,000,000 to the team that won the 2019 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$4,000,000 more in prizes to each team that lost in the first round of the 2018 Men’s World Cup than to the team that won the 2019 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$358,000,000 to the 32 teams that competed in the 2014 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$15,000,000 to the 24 teams that competed in the 2015 Women’s World Cup; and

Whereas FIFA awarded \$35,000,000 to the team that won the 2014 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$2,000,000 to the team that won the 2015 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$348,000,000 to the 32 teams that competed in the 2010 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$10,000,000 to the 16 teams that competed in the 2011 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$30,000,000 to the team that won the 2010 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$1,000,000 to the team that won the 2011 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas the 2019 Women’s World Cup tournament garnered an estimated 1,000,000,000 viewers worldwide;

Whereas the 2019 Women’s World Cup highlighted the need to eliminate the existing gender pay disparity in prize award structure in athletic competitions that has persisted for decades;

Whereas the unfair and unjust prize award allocation system used by FIFA sends a terrible message to women and girls around the world about the value of their contribution to sports;

Whereas, in 2007, Wimbledon finally implemented an equal prize payment structure for all athletes, regardless of gender; and

Whereas gender should not determine the amount of a prize award that a person or team receives in an athletic competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) urges the Fédération Internationale de Football Association to immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and to treat all athletes with the respect and dignity those athletes deserve;

(2) supports an end to the unfair and unjust practice of gender pay inequity in the workplace, including athletic competitions and related prize awards;

(3) urges all other local, State, Federal, and international organizations to eliminate gender pay inequity; and

(4) instructs the Secretary of the Senate to submit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier this month, fans across the country—and around the world—watched as the U.S. Women’s National Team made history, winning its second consecutive World Cup title, and fourth title overall. The players, coaches, and support staff of the Women’s National Team are role models to athletes young and old, male and female. They played through the tournament with the tenacity, skill, and commitment that is the hallmark of any champion.

These women—world class athletes—have consistently demonstrated their dedication to excelling in the sport and to representing our nation on the world stage. Their success on the soccer field is remarkable in itself, but many of these women have used their voices to speak out and speak up against a glaring disparity that disadvantages them, and countless women across our country and around the world: equal pay.

This is not a new issue, and it’s shameful that it is one that has not been rectified. What the players of the U.S. women’s soccer team want is pretty simple: to be treated no different than their counterparts on the men’s team. Earlier this year, the players filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Soccer Federation, arguing that disparities in pay between the men’s and women’s teams constitute discrimination on the basis of gender. But even if this lawsuit improves U.S. Soccer pay practices, much of the pay disparity will remain, due to policies of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). For example, FIFA awarded \$38 million to the winner of the 2018 Men’s World Cup, but will award only \$4 million to the U.S. women’s team for their win this year. Men’s teams also earn more from FIFA for losing a World Cup qualifying game than women’s teams earn for winning all of them and becoming world champions.

Today I am reintroducing a resolution that I first introduced in 2015, after the U.S. Women’s National Team won its third World Cup. This is a simple, straightforward, and commonsense resolution. I am calling on FIFA to immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and treat all athletes with the same respect and dignity, regardless of gender. Yet in 2015, Senate Republicans

inexplicably objected to its adoption. I'm still waiting for an explanation as to why.

I'm proud that this resolution is co-sponsored by Senators SHELDON WHITEHOUSE (D-R.I.), PATTY MURRAY (D-Wash.), RICHARD DURBIN (D-Ill.), MAZIE HIRANO (D-Hawaii), KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND (D-N.Y.), ROBERT MENENDEZ (D-N.J.), KAMALA HARRIS (D-Calif.), SHERROD BROWN (D-Ohio), RICHARD BLUMENTHAL (D-Conn.), TOM CARPER (D-Del.), JACK REED (D-R.I.), CHRIS VAN HOLLEN (D-Md.), BERNIE SANDERS (I-Vt.), EDWARD MARKEY (D-Mass.), DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D-Calif.), TAMMY DUCKWORTH (D-Ill.), MARIA CANTWELL (D-Wash.), TAMMY BALDWIN (D-Wis.), CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO (D-Nev.), JON TESTER (D-Mont.), JEANNE SHAMHEEN (D-N.H.), AMY KLOBUCHAR (D-Minn.), and MAGGIE HASSAN (D-N.H.).

Equal pay for equal work should not be a political football. All women, including the women of the U.S. National Team, deserve to be paid for the job they do, not based on their gender. Equal pay should not still be up for debate in 2019.

When time expired on the game clock during the World Cup championship game, chants of "Equal Pay!" echoed throughout the stadium in France. I am proud to join in that chorus today.

SENATE RESOLUTION 292—CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CAMEROON AND ARMED SEPARATIST GROUPS TO RESPECT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL CAMEROONIAN CITIZENS, TO END ALL VIOLENCE, AND TO PURSUE AN INCLUSIVE DIALOGUE TO RESOLVE THE CONFLICT IN THE NORTHWEST AND SOUTHWEST REGIONS

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 292

Whereas Paul Biya has held office as Cameroon's President since 1982, and won reelection to a seventh term in October 2018;

Whereas Cameroon receives United States foreign aid and participates in the Department of State-led Trans-Sahara Counter-Terrorism Partnership (TSCTP) and United States-supported efforts to counter Boko Haram;

Whereas the Government of Cameroon has increasingly cracked down on political expression, including by imprisoning opposition leaders and supporters, banning opposition and civil society conferences, reinforcing troop deployments to deter and disrupt protests, and restricting access to Facebook and other social media platforms;

Whereas the Government of Cameroon has repeatedly restricted freedoms of expression and the media nationwide by shutting down the internet, harassing and detaining journalists, refusing licenses to independent media, and intensifying political attacks against the independent press;

Whereas Boko Haram and an Islamic State-affiliated splinter group have desta-

bilized northern Cameroon since 2014, marked recently by a June 2019 attack on security forces in Far North Cameroon that killed dozens of soldiers and civilians;

Whereas the Boko Haram insurgency in Cameroon's Far North region has created an estimated 263,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs), causing an escalating humanitarian crisis in difficult to access areas;

Whereas tensions between predominantly Christian farmers and predominantly Muslim Fulani herders have contributed to religious and communal tensions throughout West and Central Africa in recent years, including in the Northwest region of Cameroon;

Whereas members of the Government of Cameroon's Rapid Intervention Battalion (BIR), which receives United States counterterrorism training and support, have been accused of torture and extrajudicial killings and may be in contravention of congressionally mandated "Leahy human rights vetting" requirements;

Whereas the 2018 Department of State Human Rights Report documented torture and abuse by Cameroonian security forces, "prolonged arbitrary detentions including of suspected Anglophone separatists by security forces," and violations of freedoms of expression and assembly;

Whereas, following Cameroon's October 7, 2018, elections, the African Union Election Observation Mission stated that "the current [legal] framework needs to be strengthened in order to safeguard the democratic principles of separation of powers, fairness, and independence and impartiality," which the Department of State echoed, emphasizing that electoral irregularities "created an impression that the election was not credible or genuinely free and fair";

Whereas Anglophone Cameroonians have long felt marginalized by official actions and policies of the Government of Cameroon;

Whereas, while the Government of France has condemned attacks by armed separatists, it has a meaningful role to play in pushing the Government of Cameroon to lift restrictions on freedoms of expression and the media, end arbitrary detention, and engage in inclusive dialogue with Anglophone leaders;

Whereas, beginning in late 2016, protests organized by lawyers, teachers, and students were violently repressed by the Government of Cameroon, leading to numerous deaths and imprisonments, including of journalists and lawyers;

Whereas, in January 2017, the Government of Cameroon ordered the suspension of internet services in the northwest and southwest regions of Cameroon, the suspension lasting for 93 days and having a major, debilitating effect on the economy, educational institutions, freedom of expression, and social communication of the region's residents;

Whereas the conflict escalated in late September and early October 2017, when Cameroonian security forces brutally cracked down on unarmed civilians peacefully demonstrating, resulting in at least 20 people dying and leaving over 100 injured;

Whereas, in 2017, armed separatist groups launched a campaign to pressure school officials in the Anglophone region to go on strike as part of a boycott against the Government of Cameroon, and began burning school buildings and threatening education officials with violence if they did not comply;

Whereas human rights monitors have documented armed groups killing traditional leaders and targeting civilians who are perceived to be supporting or working with the Government of Cameroon, and armed militants have killed Cameroonian security force personnel;

Whereas numerous credible reports from human rights monitors, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, have documented the excessive use of force by Government of Cameroon security forces against Cameroonians living in the Anglophone regions, including the burning of villages, the use of live ammunition against protestors, arbitrary arrest and detention, torture, and sexual abuse;

Whereas the Department of State has expressed serious concern over the Government of Cameroon's use of force to restrict free expression and the use of violence against individuals protesting the government's policies in the Anglophone regions;

Whereas both the Government of Cameroon security forces and armed groups have been documented targeting and brutally killing civilians in the Anglophone regions, including women and children;

Whereas in February 2019, the Department of State announced it would withhold some security assistance to Cameroon, citing credible allegations that the Cameroonian military carried out human rights violations;

Whereas United States citizen Charles Wesco was senselessly killed near the town of Bamenda, Cameroon, on October 30, 2018, after being caught in what the Department of State has characterized as "cross fire";

Whereas the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs stated in March 2019 that at least 530,000 were internally displaced in areas affected by the Anglophone conflict;

Whereas the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs has estimated that \$298,900,000 is required to provide humanitarian assistance throughout Cameroon, and only 21 percent of the appeal has been funded as of July 2019;

Whereas the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reported that it had registered roughly 36,000 Cameroonian refugees from the Anglophone regions in Nigeria as of April 2019;

Whereas some Cameroonian diaspora organizations in the United States and Cameroonian-based civil society organizations are working to address the needs of Cameroonian internally displaced persons on the northwest and southwest regions of the country and refugees in Nigeria;

Whereas 47 Anglophone activists were forcibly returned from Nigerian custody to Cameroonian authorities in January 2018, despite many having reportedly submitted asylum claims in Nigeria; and

Whereas 10 of the 47 individuals forcibly returned from Nigeria now face charges before a military court that would be punishable by the death penalty, while the other 37 reportedly remain in detention without charge: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) urges all parties to the Anglophone conflict in Cameroon, including political opposition groups, to—

(A) agree to an immediate ceasefire;

(B) guarantee unfettered humanitarian assistance;

(C) exercise restraint and ensure that protests remain peaceful; and

(D) engage in inclusive dialogue with civil society to get to a political solution that respects the rights and freedoms of the people of Cameroon;

(2) strongly condemns the abuses committed by Boko Haram, state security forces, and armed groups in the Anglophone regions, including extrajudicial killings and detentions, the use of force against nonviolent civilians and protestors, and violations of the freedoms of press, expression, religion, and assembly;

(3) affirms that the United States Government continues to hold the Government of

Cameroon responsible for upholding the rights of all citizens, regardless of their religious beliefs, political views, or the regions in which they reside;

(4) urges the Government of Cameroon to—
 (A) initiate a credible, inclusive, good, and full-faith effort to work with religious, cultural, and community leaders in the Anglophone region and the Cameroonian diaspora to engage in meaningful dialogue and address grievances and seek nonviolent solutions to resolve the conflict, including possibly involving an independent mediator in such negotiations;

(B) respect the fundamental rights of all Cameroonian citizens, including political activists, faith leaders, and journalists;

(C) ensure that any security operations are conducted in accordance with international human rights standards, including efforts to ensure security forces only use force under appropriate circumstances;

(D) investigate all allegations of human rights abuses, including religious freedom violations, committed in the Anglophone regions and take the necessary measures to prevent arbitrary detention, torture, enforced disappearances, deaths in custody, and inhumane prison conditions;

(E) promote the rule of law through more transparent accountability mechanisms;

(F) improve election processes and reform electoral institutions;

(G) promptly charge or release all those detained in the context of the Anglophone crisis, including all Anglophone activists arrested in Nigeria, and ensure that any future detainees are treated with due process, in accordance with Cameroon's penal code and international human rights norms;

(H) ensure that detainees are treated fairly and humanely, with proper judicial proceedings, including a registry of those detained by the Cameroonian security forces, and with full access to legal resources;

(I) release human rights defenders, civil society activists, political prisoners, journalists, trade unionists, teachers, faith leaders and any other citizens who have been arbitrarily arrested and detained without trial or charge; and

(J) work with United States law enforcement to thoroughly investigate and prosecute Charles Wesco's murder; and

(5) urges the armed groups in Anglophone areas to—

(A) engage with government officials to peacefully express grievances and credibly engage in nonviolent efforts to resolve the conflict;

(B) immediately stop committing human rights abuses, including killings of civilians, torture, kidnapping, and extortion;

(C) end the school boycott and immediately cease attacks on schools, teachers, and education officials, and allow for the safe return of all students to class; and

(D) immediately release all civilians illegally detained or kidnapped.

SENATE RESOLUTION 293—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 25, 2019, AS “NATIONAL LOBSTER DAY”

Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 293

Whereas lobstering has served as an economic engine and family tradition in the United States for centuries;

Whereas thousands of families in the United States make their livelihoods from catching, processing, or serving lobsters;

Whereas the lobster industry employs people of all ages, and many harvesters begin fishing as children and stay in the industry for their entire working lives;

Whereas historical lore notes that lobster likely joined turkey on the table at the very first Thanksgiving feast in 1621, and it continues to be a mainstay during many other holiday traditions;

Whereas responsible resource management practices beginning in the 1600s have created one of the most sustainable fisheries in the world;

Whereas, throughout history, United States presidents have served lobster at their inaugural celebrations and state dinners with international leaders;

Whereas lobster is an excellent, versatile source of lean protein that is low in saturated fat and high in vitamin B12;

Whereas lobster is consistently being incorporated into trending recipes such as deviled eggs and burgers;

Whereas the peak of the lobstering season in the United States occurs in the late summer;

Whereas the growing reputation of the American lobster as a unique, high-quality, and healthy food has increased its consumption and driven demand internationally;

Whereas the Unicode Consortium added a lobster to its emoji set in 2018 in recognition of the popularity of the species around the world;

Whereas countless people in the United States enjoy lobster rolls to celebrate summer, from beaches to backyards and fine dining restaurants to lobster shacks;

Whereas lobsters are inspiring children's books and characters in television shows in the United States;

Whereas lobsters have inspired artists in the United States and throughout the world for hundreds of years;

Whereas lobsters have been, and continue to be, used as mascots for sports teams; and

Whereas lobster inspires festivals from Maine to California, where people come together to celebrate their love for the crustacean: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 25, 2019, as “National Lobster Day”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 931. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3877, to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 932. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3877, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 931. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3877, to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend

the debt limit, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REQUIREMENT TO ENACT OFFSETTING SAVINGS.

(a) DETERMINATION OF WHETHER BUDGET DEAL WAS OFFSET.—On January 1, 2020, the Director shall determine the difference obtained by subtracting—

(1) the projected amount of the reduction in outlays for direct spending for the period of the total of fiscal years 2020 through 2029 under laws enacted during the period—

(A) beginning on the day after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) ending on December 31, 2019; from

(2) \$320,000,000,000.

(b) SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the difference determined under subsection (a) is a positive number, the Director shall calculate and the President shall order a sequestration for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029 in accordance with this subsection.

(2) CALCULATION.—The Director shall calculate the amount of the reduction in direct spending required under this subsection for a fiscal year by dividing the difference determined under subsection (a) by 10.

(3) ORDERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029, on the date specified in subparagraph (B), the Director shall calculate and the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, that reduces all nonexempt direct spending by the uniform percentage necessary to reduce the total amount of nonexempt direct spending for such fiscal year by the amount calculated under paragraph (2).

(B) DATE.—The date specified in this subparagraph is—

(i) with respect to fiscal year 2020, as soon as is practicable after December 31, 2019; and

(ii) with respect to each of fiscal years 2021 through 2029, the date on which the Director issues the sequestration preview report for such fiscal year pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 904(c)).

(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—When implementing a sequestration under this subsection, the Director shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 935), the exemptions specified in section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905), and the special rules specified in section 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms “direct spending” and “sequestration” have the meanings given such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c));

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(3) the term “outlays” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622).

SA 932. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3877, to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DEBT LIMIT INCREASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date described in subsection (b), the limitation in effect under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased by \$500,000,000,000.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The date described in this subsection is the earliest of the date on which the Archivist of the United States transmits to the States S. J. Res. 3 (116th Congress) in the form introduced on January 4, 2019, S. J. Res. 5 (116th Congress) in the form introduced on January 24, 2019, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or a similar amendment to the Constitution of the United States if the amendment requires that total outlays not exceed total receipts, contains a spending limitation as a percentage of the gross domestic product, and requires that tax increases be approved by a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress for their ratification.

SEC. 3. LIMIT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cause the total amount of on-budget spending for any of fiscal years 2020 through 2029 to exceed the amount specified in paragraph (2) with respect to such fiscal year.

(2) CAPS.—The amount specified in this paragraph is the following:

(A) With respect to fiscal year 2020, \$3,435,880,000,000.

(B) With respect to fiscal year 2021, \$3,367,160,000,000.

(C) With respect to fiscal year 2022, \$3,299,820,000,000.

(D) With respect to fiscal year 2023, \$3,233,820,000,000.

(E) With respect to fiscal year 2024, \$3,169,150,000,000.

(F) With respect to fiscal year 2025, \$3,232,530,000,000.

(G) With respect to fiscal year 2026, \$3,297,180,000,000.

(H) With respect to fiscal year 2027, \$3,363,120,000,000.

(I) With respect to fiscal year 2028, \$3,430,390,000,000.

(J) With respect to fiscal year 2029, \$3,498,990,000,000.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) SENATE.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(2) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the House of Representatives only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION.—In the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subparagraph (A).

Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior dated July 30, 2019.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 11 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 8:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of General John E. Hyten, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John Leslie Carwile, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia, Erin Elizabeth McKee, of California, to be Ambassador to the Independent State of Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu, Anthony F. Godfrey, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Serbia, and Herro Mustafa, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bulgaria, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at

11:50 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Sharon Fast Gustafson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, and Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member, both of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

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 Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 2:20 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

NATIONAL LOBSTER DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 293, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 293) designating September 25, 2019, as “National Lobster Day”.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further 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 with no intervening action.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 293) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AMENDING TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REDEFINE THE EASTERN AND MIDDLE JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 929, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 929) to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 929) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 929

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 113 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “and Wilson and” and inserting “Wilson, those portions of Hoke, Moore, Scotland, and Richmond counties encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall, and”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) MIDDLE DISTRICT.—The Middle District comprises the counties of Alamance, Cabarrus, Caswell, Chatham, Davidson, Davie, Durham (excluding that portion of Durham County encompassing the Federal Correctional Institution, Butner, North Carolina), Forsyth, Guilford, Hoke (excluding that portion of Hoke County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Lee, Montgomery, Moore (excluding that portion of Moore County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Orange, Person, Randolph, Richmond (excluding that portion of Richmond County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Rockingham, Rowan, Scotland (excluding that portion of Scotland County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Stanly, Stokes, Surry, and Yadkin.”

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any action commenced or pending in any judicial district of North Carolina before the date of enactment of this Act.

LUCAS LOWE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1250, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1250) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11158 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, as the “Lucas Lowe Memorial Post Office”.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 1250) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following Calendar bills, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 85 through 89, 121 through 124, and Calendar No. 162.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time and passed, 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.

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 347) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 347

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”.

FIRE CAPTAIN CORY BARR POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 1196) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, as the “Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building”, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1196

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FIRE CAPTAIN CORY BARR POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin,

shall be known and designated as the “Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building”.

LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 540) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the “Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office”, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONGRESSMAN BILL CARNEY POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 828) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the “Congressman Bill Carney Post Office”, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ARMY SPECIALIST THOMAS J. WILWERTH POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 829) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the “Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building”, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH BUFFUM CHACE POST OFFICE

The bill (S. 1272) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the “Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office”, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1272

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ELIZABETH BUFFUM CHACE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, shall be known and designated as the “Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office”.

RICHARD G. LUGAR POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 1759) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 456 North Meridian

Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the “Richard G. Lugar Post Office Building”, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RICHARD G. LUGAR POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 456 North Meridian Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the “Richard G. Lugar Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Richard G. Lugar Post Office Building”.

HENDERSON VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 1198) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 South Boulder Highway in Henderson, Nevada, as the “Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building”, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CAPTAIN ROBERT L. MARTIN POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1449) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3033 203rd Street in Olympia Fields, Illinois, as the “Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office”, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RYAN KEITH COX POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3305) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 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, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to

executive session and resume consideration of the Pittman nomination under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 31, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL T. LIBURDI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.

PETER D. WELTE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA.

JAMES WESLEY HENDRIX, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

SEAN D. JORDAN, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID L. NORQUIST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.