

bipartisan support. I am proud that two of my own bills were included in that package. The Protecting Moms and Infant Act safeguards of the addiction crisis from its heartbreaking consequences, and the CAREER Act addresses the major role that stable employment plays in long-term recovery. It encourages treatment facilities to form partnerships with local businesses and short-term housing facilities to “hand up” to those who need it.

We are proud of what we accomplished a year ago, and I am proud that my Kentucky colleague, Representative ANDY BARR, is leading the push for the CAREER Act’s companion legislation over in the House.

But we know all too well that, unfortunately, this work is far, far from finished. That is why, this very week, the Senate is moving forward \$25 million more for the CAREER Act’s transitional housing pilot program in the domestic appropriations we are advancing here on the floor.

The work will not stop there. This fight has been one of my top priorities since I became majority leader. We have put cutting-edge tools into the hands of healthcare professionals and first responders who face this crisis every single day.

In my State alone, I helped secure an unprecedented \$200 million to address the urgent crisis facing Kentuckians—a funding increase of more than 400 percent on this issue for Kentucky since I became majority leader.

We have committed to a comprehensive strategy of prevention, treatment, and enforcement efforts. At my invitation, the White House drug czar, Jim Carroll, saw some of Kentucky’s innovative leadership firsthand when he visited this past April. We have pushed the boundaries of research to find new ways to treat addiction and help families escape its painful consequences.

Earlier this month I joined Secretary Azar, NIH Director Collins, and an all-star research team at the University of Kentucky to celebrate the largest Federal grant in the University of Kentucky’s history. These new resources will fuel UK’s bold commitment to cutting overdose deaths by 40 percent in 16 counties over the coming 3 years. I was proud to help secure those funds.

Kentucky is proud that we are leading the national response, but I know my colleagues each have their own inspiring stories of how States are fighting back.

As I said, the work is far from over, but today we take a moment to celebrate the progress of the past year. To help mark this anniversary, the First Lady of the United States joined us here in the Senate yesterday.

I am proud to stand with her and the Trump administration and my colleagues in this body as we recommit ourselves to this effort.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, this anniversary also reminds us of

how many urgent issues are crying out for substantive, bipartisan, bicameral cooperation for the good of the American people.

I am talking about funding our Armed Forces and the Department of Defense, just as both sides agreed to do back in the summer when we signed on to a bipartisan, bicameral budget agreement that Democrats have lately sort of wandered away from—just wandered right away from it.

I am talking about passing the USMCA, the most consequential update to North American trade policy in a generation, which Speaker PELOSI has put on ice in order to move Democrats’ impeachment obsession to the front burner, despite the fact that there are 176,000 new American jobs on the line if we pass the USMCA.

The needs of the American people have not been put on pause just because Washington Democrats have decided it doesn’t suit them to get along with the White House.

My friends in Democratic leadership insist over and over that their focus on undoing the 2016 election will not keep them from the substantive legislation that American families need. Well, our Armed Forces are still waiting for their funding; our workers and small businesses are still waiting on their new trade agreement.

Our Senate Democratic colleagues have enough time to push partisan resolutions, such as their effort yesterday to enact a new tax cut—listen to this—their effort yesterday to enact a new tax cut for wealthy people in blue States, like New York and New Jersey, at the expense of working families everywhere else.

But so far we have seen little—little—indication that they are really ready to put our differences aside and come to the table on significant bipartisan subjects that can actually become law.

I worry that something like the landmark opioid package that we are celebrating today would not have moved through the Congress today, just one year later. I worry it would have been another victim of Democrats’ decision to avoid working with Republicans and the White House on basically anything, to keep all of their focus trained on impeachment.

I hope I am mistaken. I hope we make real progress soon. The American people are waiting on us.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the past few weeks, the House of Representatives has continued to hear testimony as part of its impeachment inquiry, which stems from allegations that President Trump pressured a foreign leader to investigate a domestic political rival. These allegations were deemed “credible” and an “urgent concern” by the inspector general of the intelligence community, who is a Trump appointee. That is how this all started, not with some Democrat stirring the pot but with a Trump appointee, a very well-respected man, saying that these allegations were credible and urgent.

The public record—the public record—shows that the White House delayed more than \$391 million in crucial security assistance to Ukraine to help the country stave off Russian aggression. In a memorandum of the President’s phone call with Ukrainian President Zelensky, released by the White House itself, the President requested Ukraine undertake investigations that would benefit him politically.

Only a few days ago, as we all know, the Chief of Staff to the President, Mick Mulvaney, admitted publicly that the administration held up security assistance for the same political reasons. Mr. Mulvaney, of course, later attempted to retract his comments, but his original statements were quite clear, and I would say that anyone who is not biased believed the original.

The White House continues to claim that fighting corruption in Ukraine was its only intent, but that is belied by the fact that it has proposed massive cuts to the State Department’s budget to fight corruption around the world. On the one hand they say we

want Ukraine to fight corruption, and, on the other hand, they cut in the budget huge amounts of money aimed at fighting corruption.

No one believes the President these days on so many things, but this issue is pretty clear. If you believe in fighting corruption, you don't cut the funds to fight corruption and at the same time pick out one country.

The facts are part of the public record. They are deeply troubling, and they come before Ambassador Taylor's testimony this week. By all accounts, Mr. Taylor's testimony was explosive and undeniably credible, detailing a pattern of activity that corroborated the account provided by the whistleblower—this time from a career diplomat, a West Point graduate who has served every administration, Democrat and Republican, since 1985.

Taylor is the kind of person Americans admire—down the road, non-political, served the country, West Point, served Democrat and Republican administrations ably well. But all of a sudden, of course, he is an anathema because he spoke truth to power. President Trump doesn't like that, and our Republican friends who cower before President Trump don't like it, but Americans know what is going on.

Mr. Taylor's written statement referred to additional documentation for the events he described in his testimony, notes and memos that are in the custody of the State Department. These records are part of a broader set of documents that is under subpoena by the House of Representatives, which the State Department is refusing to turn over to Congress. Yesterday, the House issued a new request for Mr. Taylor's documents.

What is it, Trump administration? What is it, Republicans? On the one hand, you say you want everything to be public when it comes to the hearings, but you will not give up any documents. Pompeo will not come and testify. Again, the hypocrisy, the self-serving nature of the President's statements and his Republican allies' here in the House and Senate are glaring: We don't want any sunlight when it comes to documents, when it comes to even bringing Secretary Pompeo here. But all of a sudden, because they don't like what is being heard in the hearings, we need everything public.

Well, one way or the other, I would like to see everything public—these documents—and the House has said that they will have public testimony. But the hypocrisy of our Republican friends and of the President is glaring on these issues.

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo—usually very eager to state what he thinks boldly, he is ducking, he is running. He hasn't explained this brazen disregard for the law and defiance of congressional oversight. Where is Secretary Pompeo? The pattern of Presidential misconduct alleged in the whistleblower complaint runs straight through his Department. It concerns

the most sensitive diplomatic interests of the United States, our national security, and the potential corruption of foreign policy. Where is Representative Pompeo?

We know people have disagreed and had the guts to disagree with the President. General Mattis is at the top of the list. We heard from Brett McGurk yesterday. He is there. Probably John Bolton is, too, even though I don't agree with his views on a whole lot of stuff. We all know that Representative Pompeo, when he was in the House, would be incensed with this defiance of congressional prerogatives. When he ran the Benghazi hearings—many believe extremely unfairly, in a partisan and biased way—he wanted everything to come out. Now he is ducking. Now he is hiding. We need Representative Pompeo back here, the one who said things should be made public, when it was a different administration.

To make matters worse, not only is Secretary Pompeo ducking, but maybe he is complicit in all of this, because his name has surfaced on multiple occasions in the tale of the administration's very questionable dealings with Ukraine. For instance, Ambassador Taylor's written statement indicates that on August 29, at the suggestion of National Security Advisor John Bolton, Mr. Taylor sent a first-person cable directly to Secretary Pompeo relaying his concerns about the delay in security aid. The State Department's stonewalling creates the appearance that the Secretary is covering up not only for the President but also for himself.

Without question, the State Department documents described by Mr. Taylor must be provided to Congress and the stonewalling of Congress must end. Secretary Pompeo must explain himself. He has too many questions to answer about events that concern his Department, his subordinates, and his actions. If he has any—regard for his own reputation, he would do these things.

Ideally, all Members of the House and Senate would agree on the need for Congress to see the full records here, but yesterday, as we know, a rump group of House Republicans stormed the secure facility in the Capitol—many with their cell phones in hand, even though that is against the rules—in an attempt to highlight the purported secrecy of the process. Some Representatives reportedly asked—let me repeat: asked—to be arrested.

It was an obvious and outrageous breach of House rules and of the security measures that exist to protect sensitive information from our adversaries, even more so because it was so transparently a stunt—a puerile, childish stunt. It is not the kind of thing that the House of Representatives—any Member of the House of Representatives—should stand for. The hypocrisy of those who stormed the Chamber is glaring. According to the reports, more than one-third of the House Repub-

licans who stormed the SCIF—the closed-off place that is secured—are Members who were already allowed in the closed hearings. They are allowed to ask questions of witnesses and participate in the factfinding. They know as well as I do that there will be public hearings in the future once the evidence is gathered.

This is not about process; this is a diversion. That is certain. This is because House Republicans do not like the facts and want to suppress them. That is the reason they are storming, trying to create this childish, infantile fuss. They don't want to open up the process; they want to shut it down.

If the White House and its congressional allies truly wanted an open and transparent process, the White House would provide the documents Congress requested. It wouldn't defy subpoenas. It wouldn't forbid executive branch employees from testifying. You can't just flip a switch—one day, suppress evidence, and the next, argue for a transparent and open process. The hypocrisy, the self-interested dealing, is self-evident.

Rather than stomp their feet in a fit of staged political theater, House Republicans—all Republicans—should join us in getting all the facts. That is what we ask for in this Chamber. We are not prejudging the facts. We may be a jury, but we want the facts to come out, not some but all. That is our responsibility, to get the facts out, all of us. Matters as grave as the ones that form the basis of the House impeachment inquiry require us to put country over party. That is what Democrats will do. That is what Republicans must do as well.

All the facts must come out. Those who are attempting to obstruct this factfinding inquiry may regret the day they said all they want to do is open up the process. Our Republican friends may get what they wished for—all the facts coming out. They will regret it because, at least from reports, the facts are very troubling.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Madam President, yesterday, in an address from the White House, President Trump announced he was canceling proposed sanctions against Erdogan, this time after Assad, Erdogan, and Putin got more than they could ever hope for out of President Trump's abrupt decision to withdraw U.S. troops from northern Syria. It was another nonsensical and counterproductive foreign policy decision by President Trump. The notion that the United States should trust Erdogan or Assad or Putin to secure ISIS fighters and sympathizers is not only delusional, it is downright dangerous.

President Trump's weakness in the face of strongmen and his reckless decisionmaking are putting the lives of our partners and allies and Americans at risk. As Assad, Erdogan, and Putin exert more influence on the region, as the Syrian Kurds are driven from the region and killed, as ISIS-connected

detainees escape and regroup—many of them planning to hurt us here in our homeland—again, President Trump articulates no plan to fix what he has broken.

His top officials—Secretary of State Pompeo and Secretary Esper—have canceled two briefings with the Senate, during which they were supposed to update the Senate on the administration's plan. I think they keep canceling and ducking because they don't have a plan and wouldn't know what to say. That is very, very disturbing.

My Republican colleagues, please stand up and speak out about the obvious dangers to our national security that President Trump has invited.

Some, to their credit, have done so, but others have gone so far as to excuse the President's decision even if it results in the ethnic cleansing of the Kurds, our brave and former partners in the fight against ISIS. That is not right. Democrats and Republicans must continue to press the President to correct course in northern Syria and quickly develop a plan of action to contain ISIS and secure its enduring defeat.

NOMINATION OF JUSTIN REED WALKER

Madam President, on one last issue—judges—today the Senate will consider the nomination of Justin Walker of Kentucky to serve a lifetime appointment on the Federal bench. Mr. Walker is less than 10 years out of law school, has never tried a case, has never served as cocounsel, and it is not clear how much of his 10 years has been spent practicing law. Unsurprisingly, Mr. Walker earned a rare “not qualified” rating by the American Bar Association. Very few are called “not qualified,” but he is one of them.

It seems the only reason Mr. Walker has been nominated for an austere judgeship is his membership in the Federalist Society and his far-right-wing views on healthcare, civil rights, and Executive power.

Unfortunately, Mr. Walker is part of a well-established pattern of Republicans stacking the Federal bench with manifestly unqualified judges. Another brazen example is Steven Menashi, who was slated to be considered in committee today before, thank God, it was delayed. Mr. Menashi's record of extreme views is well documented. He pushed Betsy DeVos's anti-student agenda at the Department of Education and worked closely with Stephen Miller at the White House on policies that harm immigrants. His past writings show scorn for LGBTQ Americans and women. Menashi's conduct before the Judiciary Committee was insulting, his contempt for the Senate reprehensible, and his refusal to be forthcoming about his record should be outright disqualifying. Senators GRAHAM and KENNEDY, in the committee, noted that his refusal to answer questions was troubling.

Folks like Mr. Walker and Mr. Menashi have not earned the privilege of a lifetime appointment to the bench.

I am glad that one of my Republican colleagues has said they will oppose Mr. Menashi's nomination, and other Republicans should follow suit on his nomination and on Mr. Walker's vote today.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 12 noon.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:37 a.m., recessed until 12 noon and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FISCHER).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

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 Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Rick Scott, John Thune, Lindsey Graham, Rand Paul, John Kennedy, John Cornyn, Kevin Cramer, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Patrick J. Toomey, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, John Boozman, Richard C. Shelby.

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 Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, 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 Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 332 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Stabenow
Duckworth	Menendez	Tester
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Murphy	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murray	Warner
Hassan	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Carper	Isakson	Warren
Coons	Kaine	Whitehouse
Harris	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 39.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we are rapidly approaching the 1-year mark since President Trump and the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of Mexico signed a new trade agreement to strengthen our economies.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA, will replace NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, and continue to guide trade with our northern and southern neighbors in the future.

It is estimated by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that the number of jobs in the United States that have been created directly as a result of trade with Mexico ranges around the 5 million figure, with another 8 million from binational with Canada, so this is no small matter.

Since NAFTA was enacted in 1994, a lot has changed. The way we communicate and the way we shop and even go about our daily lives rely heavily on technology that didn't exist 25 years ago.

Make no mistake—NAFTA has been a huge benefit to our country, and