

vote. It would be the same for nominees voted out of committee but blocked by the majority leader's inaction. After 180 days, they get their vote.

Let me be clear. If this rule is adopted, 180 days should not become the normal time period to confirm nominees. That is the longest it will take, but there is no reason the Senate shouldn't act quicker, as it has done throughout history.

We need to end the stealth filibuster of this President's nominees. No more burying nominees in committee. No more leaving them to languish on the Executive Calendar. The Senate will have to do its job.

Under my rules reform, Judge Garland would have his vote this week, Senators would do our jobs, and the voters would know where we stand. Many other nominees would finally get their votes. There are currently seven appellate court nominees who have been waiting more than 180 days. There are 30 district court nominees, including 5 judicial emergency districts.

Some critics may argue that the tables will be turned and Democrats will object to a Republican nominee. Well, if a nominee is truly objectionable, then any Senator, Democratic or Republican, should convince the majority of the Senate to vote against confirmation. That is how democracy works.

It is time to get our courts fully staffed so our judicial system can do its work. We have already seen the impact of a Supreme Court with eight members—cases sent back to the lower courts without decisions. The Supreme Court isn't taking cases that are likely to deadlock. These are some of the most important cases for them to decide. When we fail to do our job, the justice system suffers and the public suffers. The old saying is so true: Justice delayed is justice denied.

It is time for Senate Republicans to do their job. The Constitution gives the President the responsibility to nominate Justices on the Supreme Court, and the Senate's job is to consider those nominees. The Constitution doesn't say: Do your job except in an election year.

The President has done his job by nominating Judge Garland. Many Republicans expected him to select a highly controversial nominee—someone to energize the liberal base in an election year—but the President took his responsibility seriously. He selected a widely respected nominee with impeccable credentials, a man who should be easily confirmed. It is time for us to take our responsibility seriously, give Judge Garland the hearing he deserves, and allow the Senate to take an up-or-down vote.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time from 2 p.m. until 2:25 p.m. be under the control of Senator MANCHIN; further, that the time from 2:25 p.m. until 2:45 p.m. today be reserved as follows: Senator ENZI for 10 minutes and Senators INHOFE and BOXER for 5 minutes each.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2848, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2848) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Inhofe) amendment No. 4979, in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FOREIGN STATE-OWNED COMPANIES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have been to the floor several times to call attention to foreign state-owned companies' growing investments in American companies and commercial markets. I come to the Senate floor to discuss this further with my colleagues.

It is becoming increasingly clear that foreign state-owned companies are highly involved in international commerce and competing with companies that are privately owned by shareholders with nothing to do with any government. This trend is part and parcel of globalization. While there are some obvious benefits to globalization, we also need to be aware of the challenges it may bring with it, and I think this is one of them.

To give an example, I have seen this trend at work in the agricultural sector of our economy. ChemChina, a Chinese state-owned company, is currently working on a deal to buy the Swiss-based seed company Syngenta. About one-third of Syngenta's revenue comes from North America—meaning the company is heavily involved with American farmers, including Iowans—and that is why I am interested in this transaction.

I have already been considering the approval aspect of this proposed merg-

er. Senator STABENOW and I asked the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to review thoroughly the proposed Syngenta acquisition with the Department of Agriculture's help. We have raised the issue because, as I have said before, protecting the safety and integrity of our food system is a national security imperative as well as an economic issue.

There is another aspect of this issue I would like to focus on. I would like to consider the flip side of the approval question. As their involvement in international commerce grows, how can we ensure that foreign state-owned companies are held to the same standards and the same requirements as their non-state-owned counterparts or companies that are in the private sector?

First, consider two age-old principles of international law. One is that American courts don't exercise jurisdiction over foreign governments as a matter of comity and respect for equally independent countries. Each is sovereign. This is called the foreign sovereign immunity. The second is that when foreign governments do in fact enter into commerce and then behave like market participants—conducting a state-owned business, for example—they are not entitled to foreign sovereign immunity because they are no longer acting as a sovereign but rather acting like any business. In that case, they should be treated just like any other market participant. This is called the commercial activity exception to the principle of foreign sovereign immunity.

Congress codified both of these age-old principles in the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act of 1976. All of these principles are well and good, but I am concerned that in some cases they may not have their intended effects in today's global marketplace.

Some foreign state-owned companies have recently used the defense of foreign sovereign immunity—the principle that a foreign government can't be sued in American courts—as a litigation tactic to avoid claims by American consumers and companies that non-state-owned foreign companies would have to answer. In some cases, foreign state-owned corporate parent companies have succeeded in escaping Americans' claims. They have done this by arguing that the entity conducted commercial activities only through a particular subsidiary, not a parent company often closer to the foreign sovereign. Unless a plaintiff, which may be an American company or consumer, is able to show complete control of the subsidiary by the parent company, the parent company is able to get out of court before the plaintiffs even have a chance to make their case.

This results in two problems. First, there is an unequal playing field, where state-owned companies benefit from a defense not available to a non-state-owned company. Second, there is an uphill battle for American companies and consumers seeking to sue state-