

2015, Chuck Todd of NBC's Meet the Press asked Dr. Carson whether he thought Islam is consistent with the Constitution. Dr. Carson answered, "No, I don't, I do not." Dr. Carson's remarks revealed a fundamental misunderstanding about the First Amendment and religious liberty. And Dr. Carson's remarks about the LGBT community also raise concerns about tolerance.

Because of all the concerns that I have raised, I will not be able to support Dr. Carson's nomination for this post. However, should he be confirmed, I will do everything possible to help make his tenure successful. Specifically, I was heartened by Dr. Carson's statements about wanting to address the hazards of lead paint. I was pleased that, at his confirmation hearing, Dr. Carson agreed that he would urge President Trump to continue the White House task force that President Obama created after the Freddie Gray tragedy in Baltimore to help Baltimore by trying to break down some of the silos among different Federal agencies. We have a lot of work to do in Baltimore and throughout Maryland.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

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

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

Mr. CRAPO. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Cornyn	Graham
Barrasso	Cotton	Grassley
Blunt	Crapo	Hatch
Boozman	Cruz	Heitkamp
Brown	Daines	Heller
Burr	Donnelly	Hoeven
Capito	Enzi	Inhofe
Cassidy	Ernst	Johnson
Cochran	Fischer	Kennedy
Collins	Flake	King
Corker	Gardner	Lankford

Lee	Risch	Tester
Manchin	Roberts	Thune
McCain	Rounds	Tillis
McConnell	Rubio	Toomey
Moran	Sasse	Warner
Murkowski	Scott	Wicker
Paul	Shelby	Young
Perdue	Strange	
Portman	Sullivan	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote on the nomination, and I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

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 Richard Perry, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy.

John Boozman, Chuck Grassley, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, James Lankford, James M. Inhofe, Michael B. Enzi, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Bill Cassidy, John Barrasso, Orrin G. Hatch, Jerry Moran, David Perdue, John Thune, 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 James Richard Perry, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cardin	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Stabenow
Corker	Kennedy	Strange
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Van Hollen
Coons	Markey	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, and the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Richard Perry, of Texas, to be Secretary of Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will speak briefly, as I know the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska is waiting to speak.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

CALLING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL COUNSEL

Mr. LEAHY. Every day we learn more about the troubling connections between the Russian Government and both President Trump's administration and his campaign, but last night kind of topped everything—a revelation that Attorney General Sessions met with Russian officials during the height of the Presidential campaign, which raises a new level of alarm.

One of the reasons is, we now know the Attorney General, under oath, misled the Senate Judiciary Committee in response to my direct question about his contacts with Russian officials. I asked then-Senator Sessions if he had

been in contact with anyone connected to any part of the Russian Government about the 2016 election. His answer was unequivocal. He said no. He provided a similarly misleading response to Senator FRANKEN, saying that he was “not aware” of any connections between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government.

Especially those of us who are lawyers, and who have had a chance to serve as attorney general or as prosecutors in our States, know it is an egregious breach of public trust that Attorney General Sessions has not recused himself from this investigation. I think everybody would agree he has to recuse himself. Of course, as this goes on, the question now arises: Has he perjured himself?

In response to these reports, the Attorney General claims that he “never met Russian officials to discuss issues of the campaign.” That is a wholly inadequate response. The Attorney General was a top adviser to the Trump campaign. He took a private, undisclosed meeting with the Russian Ambassador during the height of concerns about Russian involvement in our election. Think about it. There are reports everywhere about concerns about Russian involvement in the election of the United States, and he has an undisclosed meeting with the Russian Ambassador.

He also met with the Russian Ambassador during an event at the Republican National Convention. One would think, at the Republican National Convention, it is possible that politics might be discussed. Now, if the Attorney General thinks his explanation is sufficient after he misled Congress about these contacts, of course, he is mistaken. I don’t say that as a Democrat. I think everybody would agree to that. What I worry about is that the Attorney General is only the latest Trump administration official who has attempted to mask his contacts with the Kremlin.

The President’s first National Security Advisor lied to the Vice President about his communications with the Russian Ambassador. He only resigned after the media reported how he had lied to Vice President PENCE, and even that was weeks after the President had been informed. He had to leave only when it became public. The President’s Chief of Staff attempted to use the FBI—which, of course, would be in violation of Justice Department policies—to suppress news reports about Russian contacts. I have been here through seven previous Presidents—Republicans and Democrats. You would assume they would play by the rules. This administration seems to want to make up the rules.

My concern is not just what the administration might be doing; my concern is about Russia. We are, I believe strongly, the greatest democracy history has known. We are the longest existing democracy in history, and now we have Russia meddling and trying to

undermine our democracy. Every American should worry about that. Every American should be frightened, not just concerned but frightened. It is an attack on our democracy. This is one of the most disturbing national security challenges facing our country. Russian President Putin ordered a multifaceted campaign that was aimed at helping Donald Trump win and undermining public faith in our election. That should alarm and outrage everybody no matter what party one belongs to.

We didn’t hear a word about it in the President’s speech on Tuesday during the joint session of Congress. In fact, the President’s only reaction has been to disparage American investigators, to disparage the intelligence community, to cast journalists who report on this as “enemies of the American people.” Journalists are not enemies of the American people. Russia is the enemy of the American people. Putin is the enemy of the American people. Do not cast our journalists, do not cast our investigators, do not cast our intelligence people, do not cast those who dare speak out as being enemies of America. Point to the real enemies—Vladimir Putin and those he controls.

It is about time we take this seriously. I have been here 42 years. I have never seen such a perfidious threat to our democracy than what we are seeing in Vladimir Putin, and my concern is the administration does not call it out for what it is. We Americans deserve to know the facts. We deserve a full and fair investigation. We deserve one that is free from any political influence.

I have repeatedly called on Attorney General Sessions, who was one of President Trump’s top advisers during the campaign, to recuse himself and appoint a special counsel to conduct the investigation. Earlier this week, he said: “I would recuse myself on anything that I should recuse myself on.” This morning, he said he would recuse himself “whenever it’s appropriate.” This would be a ludicrous response from a law clerk at the Department of Justice. From the Attorney General, it is dissembling.

Recusal is not optional here. It is required by very clear Justice Department regulations. It is required to maintain at least a semblance of integrity in this investigation. The Attorney General has to recuse himself because, as stated clearly in Department rules, he is obviously “closely identified” with the President due to his “service as a principal adviser.” That is the rule, and that is the rule whether it is a Republican or a Democratic administration. It describes his relationship with the President.

The investigation has to be led by someone who, in reality and in appearance, is impartial and removed from politics. That does not describe someone who was in the trenches of a political campaign with the subjects of the investigation while they were allegedly engaged in the very activity under in-

vestigation. It does not describe somebody who misled Congress—who misled the Republican-led Senate Judiciary Committee—about his own activities that have been implicated in the investigation.

This is not a close call. We know Russia is doing everything to undermine our democracy. Let’s stand up for America. Let’s do what is best for our country. The Attorney General should start by stepping aside. Then what we need is an independent investigation, and we need answers.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska for her indulgence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the matter pending before the Senate this morning is the nomination of Rick Perry to be Secretary of Energy, and I have come to the floor to speak to that nomination.

As with Representative ZINKE, whom we confirmed to be Secretary of the Interior just yesterday, I am equally proud to support Governor Perry’s nomination. I know colleagues from both sides of the aisle will be joining me as we make statements in support of this individual to our new President’s Cabinet.

Before that though, here’s a little bit on Governor Perry’s background. He is one who has devoted his life—literally decades of his life—to public service. After graduating from Texas A&M, he joined the U.S. Air Force. He piloted C-130 tactical airlift aircraft in Europe as well as in the Middle East. He has served as a State representative, agriculture commissioner, Lieutenant Governor, and of course Governor of Texas.

During his time as Governor, Rick Perry showed that economic growth and environmental stewardship cannot only survive and coexist, but that they can really thrive. Over the course of 14 years, Texas added 2.2 million jobs, saw its population grow by more than 6 million people, and at the same time he had this robust growth within his State’s population, the State reduced its carbon dioxide emissions by 17 percent, reduced its sulfur dioxide emissions by 56 percent, and reduced its nitrous oxide emissions by 66 percent. So in most States where you have a considerable plus-up in your population and a growing economy, you also see growing levels of impact, growing levels of emission. However Governor Perry dealt with this head-on, and we saw the results over the course of 14 years in the State of Texas.

He led an effort to decommission older and dirtier power plants. He prioritized the development of emerging and innovative technologies, including carbon sequestration and capture. As a result of his leadership in the State of Texas, that State now leads our Nation in producing more wind energy than all but five other countries.

Coming from the State of Alaska, as the Presiding Officer and I do, we recognize that we are labeled as an oil State. Well, Texas certainly has been labeled as an oil-producing State. Yet under Governor Perry's leadership, we have seen Texas lead the Nation in producing more wind energy than all but five other countries. For those who may come to the floor and suggest that, somehow or another, Governor Perry is anti-environment or bring up the issue of climate change and suggest that he does not support care for our environment, that is simply not the case, and clearly in his case, actions speak louder than words.

As Texas's longest serving Governor, Rick Perry guided a large, diverse and very complex State government to economic success. Again, when we are talking about States, Alaska is always out there bragging about our size, but if Texas were its own country, it would be the 12th largest economy in the world. So it is one thing to talk about size just by way of geography, but I think it is important—when we are talking about economic contribution, the size of Texas as the 12th largest economy in the world is pretty significant.

What happened in the State of Texas? Not only did the people of Texas give their endorsement to Governor Perry to ask him to serve again as Governor, they gave him their endorsement for his work by reelecting him to office not once but twice—14 years. Governor Perry is a principled leader, and that will serve him well as he takes the helm at the Department of Energy.

DOE has a very important mission, ranging from the maintenance of our nuclear weapons stockpile to the research and development of new energy technologies. At the same time it is also a department, a bureaucracy, something that I think we recognize. It is large. It is cumbersome, with tens of thousands of employees and contractors. I think the example Governor Perry showed as the State leader of Texas is an example that will do well at the Department of Energy—capable of really setting a good direction for the Department.

It has been suggested that he is not one of them in the sense that he is not an award-winning scientist, but, as I mentioned at his hearing before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, you do not necessarily need to have a scientist to lead other scientists; you need to have somebody who is a good, strong, competent, capable manager. That is what Governor Perry has demonstrated, and that is what the Department of Energy needs. He will hold his employees and contractors accountable. We know he will be a responsible steward of taxpayer dollars.

I think he will work to continue to break down the research silos that have frustrated the Department and work to find ways where there can be greater collaboration, greater working together.

I am also confident that he will pursue policies that will ultimately provide us with more energy, more stable sources of energy for us where—unfortunately, we have great sources of energy, but it is high cost. We need to be working with the Department of Energy. We need collaboration there to do what we can to reduce the cost of energy, as well as reduce the amount of energy we consume. By supporting basic research, encouraging scientific exploration, and fostering innovation, the Department will increase access to energy, make it more affordable, and continue to improve its environmental performance.

We have 17 National Labs. We are very proud of them. These National Labs are at the heart of those efforts. I have had good conversations with Governor Perry. He reaffirmed in our committee hearing that he clearly recognizes and values the work done by the men and women at our National Labs.

One area, which we do not cover within our Committee on Energy and Natural Resources but which is a big part of DOE's mission, is the maintenance and the protection of America's nuclear weapons. Governor Perry recognizes the importance of that mission, and he is committed to working with experts at the NNSA to maintain a proper stockpile stewardship program.

I believe Governor Perry will also put his management experience to work on a challenge that has really vexed the Department and affected States for a long period of time. He recognizes that we must clean up the legacy wastes that have been left behind by our nuclear weapons programs, particularly at the largest of these sites in Washington State. My hope is that, through his leadership, the Office of Environmental Management can finally move off of GAO's high-risk list. I know these conversations have been had with many members on the committee. It has been pressed as a priority. But, again, ensuring that we deal with these legacy waste sites has to be a priority.

I will reiterate that my hope is that Governor Perry will help address the crisis of rural energy prices in Alaska, as well as in other parts of the country where unfortunately we face high energy costs.

The Department must do a better job of partnering with institutions. In our State of Alaska, we have the opportunity to work with DOE collaboratively. We have been the incubators of good ideas, whether it is in energy microgrids or in some of the other pioneering way, we have done it because of necessity. We have no other options. We look to our institutions to find these good ideas, build on them, and work to bring down the costs and transition our many remote communities that are still relying on diesel power. Far too many of our communities are still dependent on diesel and that is just not right.

So working with Alaska—allow us to be that proving ground for the Depart-

ment of Energy. Allow us to be that place where we can first deploy some of these new ideas, these innovative ideas, these projects to help lower the costs and really make a difference in people's lives.

Again, I am proud to be here to support Governor Perry's nomination. I believe he has the management experience we need in the Department of Energy right now to help pursue scientific discovery and to promote innovation, to maintain and safeguard our nuclear weapons stockpile, to make progress on the cleanup of legacy waste, and to partner with States like Alaska that suffer from high energy costs.

I think we recognize that he has his work cut out for him, but we are counting on him to fulfill those responsibilities and to keep the Department of Energy as one that we look to for true leadership not only here in the United States but around the world.

Governor Rick Perry has a strong record of results based on his public service in the State of Texas. He is a proven leader, and I am confident he will do a good job for us leading the Department of Energy in this new administration. I will be supporting his nomination, and I certainly urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today is Texas Independence Day—a day that inspires pride and gratitude in the hearts of all 28 million Texans.

Before I came to the floor, I asked the Presiding Officer, who hails from the great State of Alaska, to remind me—and he did—that Alaska is 2½ times the size of Texas in terms of landmass, not in terms of population. But today commemorates the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence, when Texas declared itself a republic and independent from the Nation of Mexico.

Here in the Senate, we remember the sacrifice of those who came before us and laid the foundation for our State by reading a letter written by William Barret Travis, a defender of the Alamo. That tradition goes back to 1961, when then-Senator John Tower started that tradition. I am told my colleague Senator CRUZ will read that letter in full later today, perhaps around 12:30, carrying on this great tradition. So today I wish to express my gratitude for these Texas patriots, many of whom would later serve in the U.S. Congress, including Sam Houston, whose Senate seat I am honored to now occupy.

Sam Houston came from his farm outside Huntsville, TX, in 1846. It took

him about 3 weeks to get to Washington, DC. Of course, he didn't have a modern mode of transportation, but I always marvel at the fact that it now takes me about 3 hours to get home, where it took old Sam 3 weeks just to make a one-way trip.

U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

Mr. President, on another matter, last week I had the great privilege of hosting a number of my congressional colleagues at the Texas border. At a time when so many people are talking about the border of the United States and Mexico, I thought it was important to bring colleagues who were willing to come to learn and listen about the impact of trade, border security, and our relationship with Mexico on my State and on the United States. Of course, this border is so important on all of those issues—security, trade, the economy. It is important to see where they intersect. I am glad they had a chance to come to listen and learn last week.

We did receive a number of very important and useful briefings from Customs officials, Border Patrol agents, and other Federal partners in three major areas along the border, including the Rio Grande Valley. We were in McAllen, TX, Laredo, and Del Rio. I think what my colleagues discovered—if they didn't already know it—is how varied each part of the border is. This is not just true in Texas. It is true in San Diego. It is true in Arizona. It is true in New Mexico. When anybody suggests that we can attain a goal that we all share, which is border security, by just one solution, I think it is important to examine that conclusion and to test it because, frankly, I think what the Border Patrol will tell you is that what we need is infrastructure, yes. We need technology, yes. Then we need people.

That is the formula—personnel, technology, and infrastructure. In my own view, border security is a question of political will. The previous administration did not have that political will. I believe this administration does, and it has been long overdue. I welcome that.

We are going to be working with our State and local officials to make sure that they have the resources they need in order to get the job done. At the same time, I think what we were able to demonstrate to some of our friends from out of State is that we have an important trading relationship with Mexico. As a matter of fact, 5 million American jobs depend on binational trade with Mexico.

We went to one of the largest land ports in the country. I think, maybe, it is the largest port of the country—Laredo, TX—where some 15,000 trucks enter the United States every day. It is a huge influx of cargo and, fortunately, businesses all up and down and along the border have worked with the law enforcement agencies, with Customs and Border Protection to make sure that we can expedite the flow of legal trade into the United States. At the same time, we police for the entry of il-

legal drugs and for people illegally entering the United States without proper authority.

One reason why my State has done pretty well relative to the rest of the country in terms of our economy is because of our business-friendly attitude. We believe in lower taxes, reasonable regulation, and a welcoming attitude when it comes to people who make investments and who want to come to our State and start businesses or grow businesses.

We all know that roughly 70 percent of job growth in this country comes not from the Fortune 500 companies but from those small and medium-sized businesses. We work very hard to be a business-friendly State. Why? It is not just because we care about businesses but because we care about the workers who work at those employers.

As one of my former colleagues likes to say, you can't claim to be worker-friendly if you are hostile to the businesses that employ them. That is an inconsistent approach. You need to be consistent.

In addition to the issue of illegal entry into the United States by individuals who come without regard to our immigration laws, we also have a tremendous influx of illegal drugs into the United States. I think one of the things I was reminded of that we all should be cognizant of is that when we focus on the illegal drug activity in Mexico, Central America, or South America, we need to look in the mirror as a nation because the only way those cartels exist and make the money they make and commit the mayhem and violence they commit is because of demand in the United States.

I was very encouraged to hear Secretary John Kelly—former Marine Gen. John Kelly. He is still a marine, always a marine, but now he has taken off the uniform and assumed the responsibility of Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. He previously served as the commanding general in the Southern Command, as the Presiding Officer knows, which covers the combatant command from south of Mexico down to Central America and South America. So he is very familiar with the region. He made the point, before his confirmation hearing, that there is one thing he would like to see the United States do—effect a major societal and cultural change to deal with the demand for illegal drugs, which fuels all of the cartels and the transnational criminal organizations which plague our security situation along the border and in our neighbors to the south.

I want to say that I am appreciative of our colleagues who joined us on the trip—Senators TILLIS and HELLER, Congressman ROUZER from North Carolina, and my colleagues from Texas, Congressmen JOHN CARTER and MIKE CONAWAY.

I also wanted to say how much I appreciate Speaker RYAN coming to Texas and the Rio Grande Valley last

Wednesday for, unfortunately, a short period of time, but we are all grateful that he came at all—I think, at the invitation of people like Congressman MICHAEL MCCAUL, chairman of the Homeland Security Committee in the House of Representatives. I think it is going to take all of our efforts working together to effect and implement the President's vision of border security, a goal we all share.

I think what we all were reminded of is that it is more complex than some people assume, and it is going to take a combination of approaches, including personnel. We need to plus-up the Border Patrol because it doesn't do you any good if you identify somebody illegally bringing a shipment of drugs or illegally entering the United States if you don't have a Border Patrol agent to stop them. Also, the very useful border infrastructure—fencing and walls, for example, in the Hidalgo County area—were actually implemented as a way to improve their levee system when the Rio Grande river floods. They have actually created a dual-use structure that actually satisfies the Border Patrol's need for physical infrastructure along with levee improvements in a win-win situation.

I believe that consulting with local officials and local stakeholders, we at the Federal level can come up with more of those win-win solutions. The point is that we have learned a lot, particularly in our military, about how to use technology to keep us safe—whether it is unmanned aerial vehicles or ground sensors or radars. Actually, they have several new aerostats, or balloons, up in the sky that are basically the eyes in the sky, or radar, which do a tremendous job helping to identify people illegally entering the United States and equipping the Border Patrol and law enforcement authorities with the sort of early notice they need in order to interdict people illegally entering the country.

I will close by saying that one of the always surprising things I learn when I go to the Rio Grande Valley and talk to the Border Patrol is this. I ask them: How many different countries are represented by the people whom you detain illegally entering the United States? Obviously, the majority of them come from our neighbors to the south, not as much from Mexico as you might suspect anymore, because the Mexican economy is doing better and people are finding more opportunities there. But right now, the majority of the flow of people illegally entering the United States is from Central America.

Unfortunately, the tragic situation there where mothers and fathers worry about their children—whether they are going to be killed by gangs or whether they are going to be forced to join gangs—and somehow make the very painful and difficult choice of turning their children over to human smugglers to try to make their way up the backbone of Mexico and into the

United States, to be deposited on our doorstep in the United States.

Last week when the congressional delegation was in McAllen, we went through the processing area where some of these immigrants from Central America were being processed. I asked a young boy there, who was in the process of being processed—through my regional director, because he spoke only Spanish—how old he was, and he said he was 6 years old. He wasn't unaccompanied in that trip from Central America, but his mother and father thought it was important enough to get him out of that ravaged part of the world, where the prospects are not very good, and to turn him over to a human smuggler to make his way up into the United States, only to find himself at a Border Patrol processing unit in McAllen, TX.

My point is that I also met a young man from India, and I asked him: How much did it cost you to get to the United States from India?

He said: About \$6,000.

I said: How did you get here?

He said: I took a plane from India.

He went through Moscow, he said, and ended up in Central America, where he worked his way up with the help of human smugglers into the United States.

I mention that only to point out that we have a vulnerability there where anybody determined enough or with enough money can find their way into the United States. We generally assume these people are economic migrants—in other words, looking for opportunity. We all understand that. Those same vulnerabilities create potential danger for our Nation and our local communities when people with unknown motives exploit those same vulnerabilities to come into the United States.

The last point I will make, again, to emphasize the global nature of illegal immigration into the United States is this. We saw that the Border Patrol has several rescue beacons in Brooks County, TX. This is about 70 miles from the U.S.-Mexico border. What happens is that the human smugglers will transport people into the United States and across the river. They will put them in stash houses, really in terrible conditions. As a matter of fact, we went to one of these stash houses. They found 18 migrants in the stash house waiting to be transported up the highway into the heartland of America.

One of the checkpoints there is at Falfurrias, about 70 miles away from the border. What happens is that the smugglers will have people packed into a van or some vehicle, and before they get to the checkpoint, they will tell the immigrants to get out. If it is hot, they will give them a gallon jug—a milk jug—full of water and they will say: I will see you on the other side. They go around the checkpoint, out through the very difficult ranchland, and meet up on the north side, and then are transported off.

In Brooks County, TX, we went by a cemetery where a number of unknown and unnamed migrants have been buried because they have died due to exposure. Some of these immigrants coming from Central America come up through Mexico. You can imagine the conditions they have been exposed to, and in the heat of the summer, they have been kicked out of a car and told “meet us on the north side,” with a gallon jug of water, and some of them don't make it. Of course the smugglers don't care about people. You are just a commodity. You are just a paycheck. So they will leave stragglers behind. Many of the ranchers said they found as many as 100 different dead bodies on their property over an unspecified period of time.

But there is a rescue beacon that the Border Patrol has down there that is in three languages. It is in English, Spanish, and Chinese. You might ask, why in the world would you need Chinese written on a rescue beacon where somebody thinks “OK, I am not going to make it; I need help” and goes and presses the button on the rescue beacon—that you need English, Spanish, and Chinese. Well, because they have had Chinese immigrants come through that border region, as well, like the young man from India whom I mentioned earlier. And we have had people from Cuba and from literally all around the world, including some nations that are hosts to terrorist organizations.

This is not only an economic situation. This is not only a law enforcement problem when it comes to drug interdiction. It is a humanitarian crisis, as well. But it is also a national security issue. I think all the leaders of the intelligence community will concede, given the fact that people from 60 different countries have been detained coming across the southwestern border just in the last year by the McAllen sector of the Border Patrol.

We have a lot of work to do. I hope we will be able to work with the President and this administration and in a bipartisan way to come up with the tools we need in order to secure our border. We need to enforce our immigration laws. Of course, 40 percent of illegal immigration in this country occurs not from people entering the country illegally, it is from people entering legally and overstaying their visa. We may not catch up with them until they commit a serious crime and they are arrested by local law enforcement. I think this is what causes so many people to be angry at the Federal Government for not enforcing our laws. And many of our colleagues, me included, would like to do more to fix our broken immigration system generally, but until we regain the public's confidence that we are actually serious about securing our border and enforcing our laws, I don't believe we can have that conversation. I don't believe we are going to be successful, which I would like to see us be.

I think the first thing we need to do is to work with the administration in order to accomplish the goal of securing the border. Again, in the matter of political will, we know how to do it. We just need to have the desire to get it done. And then once we have regained the public's confidence that the Federal Government is once again living up to its responsibilities, then I think we can have that more expansive conversation about what our immigration system should look like.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to talk a few minutes about the challenges so many of our Cabinet members face trying to restore our infrastructure, to maintain our park system, and to create the public-private partnerships the President mentioned earlier this week in his vision for infrastructure reform.

Certainly Governor Perry, whose nomination we are debating right now, will have many opportunities in Energy to do that, in the research components of Energy and the partnership components that can be there.

We just confirmed a new Secretary of Interior, RYAN ZINKE. One of our great assets as a nation is the Federal park system. We are now entering the second hundred years of that Federal park system, and that second hundred years is going to be defined by partnerships in ways the first hundred years weren't.

The park system is a great way to enjoy the blessings we have and the rich geography, the scenic beauty—some of these parks really reflect the great challenges people faced as they settled the country—and also there are historic parks that reflect the history. Sometimes our parks do both of those things.

I think all of my colleagues are aware of the Gateway Arch in St. Louis, one of the most visited national parks, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial there celebrating President Jefferson, celebrating the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, and really celebrating that long movement as people moved west—eventually really west and really northwest, Mr. President, where you live in Alaska. But the Gateway Arch is visited often. It opened in 1967, and so now we are 50 years into that particular part of our system. The original park itself needed a lot of restoration, but 50 years later, you look at that park and you look at how it has been used and decide how it could be better used.

What most of my colleagues probably aren't aware of is that right now, it is the biggest investment the National Park Service is making in the system at this moment, trying to connect the Gateway Arch to the Old Courthouse in St. Louis, the Federal courthouse where the Dred Scott case was tried—they are trying to connect that park to

the rest of the city in ways that—when it was built, it was separated by an interstate highway, so you would go see the park, but you wouldn't get to the rest of the national park side there very often.

Rethinking that is important, but what is maybe even more important is this is the biggest park project in the history of the country where private donors provided more of the money than the government did. This is not easily done. If for 100 years you have been doing something one way, it is not easy to immediately begin to say: We are going to do it another way from now on.

If you are in charge, like Secretary Jewell was put in charge of this project—and by the way, I think she has done a good job, as has her regional director, understanding that if you are going to do things differently, they have to be different.

It would be great if the city and private donors—the city even voted a tax just for this project, to provide millions of dollars that the project would be spending. Of course, I think initially the Park Service would think: Isn't that great? We now get this money from private donors, and we now get this money from a city tax, in addition to a portion of the money we are still getting appropriated by the Congress, and we will just spend it the way we have always spent it, as if we had no partners. But that didn't work out very well at all. The partners in the project actually wanted to be partners in the project.

As we look at the next hundred years of this great National Park System, I think we have to understand that for that to work and for that to work in a new way, we have to treat it differently. We are seeing that in St. Louis. We are seeing the three different groups come together in ways that have provided the funding. But, frankly, they also need to be at the table when you talk about how you are going to spend the funding.

We changed the law in Congress just a couple of years ago so that private money, if it is being held by the Federal Government, as it has been on that project, if there is any interest to be earned, if there is any benefit from that money, it also goes to the project rather than going into general revenue.

The goal here would be to do everything we can, if we are going to have a different park system for the next hundred years, to really encourage the next group of people to step up and say: We want to provide—as in the case in St. Louis, MO—more than half of the money, but we would like to have some input on how that is going to be used and how this is going to meet the needs of the community.

But also everybody who visits there, as they connect with the community uniquely in that St. Louis park—Missouri has a great park system. I think we are rated as one of the top four park systems in the country, our State sys-

tem. In fact, right now we are looking at one of those State parks at Ste. Genevieve, which was a part of our State that was first settled by French settlers. The number of buildings there dating right back to the turn of the 19th century—1801, 1804—is reflective of how French settlers built buildings, which is different from how other settlers did.

There is a lot to learn about how we come together as a people in so many of our parks, as well. So when Secretary Zinke takes that job, one of the new opportunities is to build on what is already started in places like St. Louis and figure out how we can have those kinds of partnerships when the President talks about infrastructure expansion and how we are going to look for new ways to do that. As you look at new ways to do that, you have to really be willing to think of how you approach this in a way that encourages partners to be part of it.

Clearly, infrastructure—one of the great benefits of where we are located is where we are located. We have an ocean on two sides. We have a river that runs up the middle of the country, that connects the country in unique ways to all the water travel of the world. We have these coasts on each side that are beneficial to this if we connect ourselves in the right ways.

So the President's view that the road system, the airport system, the port system all need to work in a way that links us up to be better competitors and links us up in a way that allows us to create economic opportunities and better jobs for families is important.

So that kind of partnership, the partnership the park system is in—I think we are seeing the mold established, the model established for how that would work in St. Louis right now at the Arch. In the next couple of years, that project will be completed. It will be different than it was 50 years ago because people want to see things differently than they did 50 years ago.

With Secretary Perry, who should be confirmed today—I think clearly will be confirmed today—his opportunities at Energy to look for partners who add to what we can do there in ways we haven't thought of before—just like we use research money now, take that research money in health research and research money in ag research to bring other people into this discussion that creates opportunities for who we can be.

As we move slowly and in a way that has really made it difficult to take advantage of this new administration, we are apparently going to be able to confirm two nominees to the Cabinet today. But we are still way behind, by any measure, the history of the country in working with a new administration to let them take responsibility. There are going to be 500, 1,000 nominees—I think there are about 1,000 Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries who come once we are done with the Cabinet. I hope we can all find a way to

get this done, with an understanding that whether or not you agree with the election, the election was held and the new administration has the responsibility for government. It is the job of the Senate and the Senate alone to be sure that those Cabinet officers and the people who support those Cabinet officers and departments are put in place early, as well.

Looking at the park system, looking at partnership, and looking at how important it is that we are willing to do things in a different way is something we ought to be thinking about in this week that we confirm the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and, later today, the Secretary of Energy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak on the nomination of Rick Perry, Governor of Texas, to be the Secretary of Energy. I just heard my colleague talking a little bit about the nomination process and hearings and the Cabinet. I want to emphasize that we have never seen a Cabinet quite like this—with their connections to the private sector, their financial holdings, a variety of other things.

The American people deserve for us to do a good job of digging into the backgrounds of the various nominees so that the people know who exactly the President has chosen to run these important government agencies. We are going to continue this process both for Cabinet-level nominees and also those nominated to serve in sub-Cabinet positions.

I am here today to speak about the nominee to serve as Secretary of Energy—Governor Rick Perry of Texas. Most people probably remember Governor Perry for his famous quip during a Presidential debate during which he announced he wanted to get rid of three agencies, but could not remember that the Department of Energy was one of them.

So he became famous for forgetting that he wanted to abolish the Department of Energy. In some ways, this allowed everyone to focus on exactly how important the Department of Energy is to our Nation. The Department's vital missions not only help us with the R&D of the future, but also with our national security. The national laboratories that are overseen by the Department drive our leadership in a global economy. They are based on innovation and play a vital role across the Nation for people who rely on affordable and efficient energy to heat their homes, run their appliances, and connect to the internet.

The Department of Energy safeguards our nuclear arsenal. It also is responsible for cleaning up the waste generated by our nuclear weapons complex facilities that helped us win World War II and the cold war. The Department also plays a key role in protecting our energy infrastructure from cyber attacks. It also makes important contributions to our understanding of climate science, enabling the collection and management of data needed to understand our changing environment and is a major driver of innovation.

Before Mr. PERRY was even nominated, the transition team was already targeting Department of Energy climate scientists. The transition team sought a list of those Department employees and contractors that had worked on climate change issues during the Obama Administration. This came across as an attempt to try to shut down those climate scientists and target them in a Trump Administration.

Silencing scientists is outrageous. We need an Energy Secretary who is not only going to protect the scientists who work at DOE no matter what their responsibility is but who is also going to make sure we use that important data for research and for mitigating the impacts of climate change on our coastal communities and pristine areas. Climate change is already producing significant impacts in the State of Washington and throughout the West. We need scientists working on this issue to get our States and local governments the best data and information possible.

As I previously mentioned, the Department of Energy is also an important driver of innovation. There is so much happening in the areas of smart buildings and modernizing our grid and resiliency and energy efficiency.

The thing that concerned me most about Governor Perry was his unwillingness to commit wholeheartedly to preserving the Electricity Office and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy within the Department. We need these offices and their R&D so that the U.S. can continue to create jobs in our growing energy economy.

Continued aggressive research and development is necessary if we are going to become more energy efficient and consumers are going to have access to reliable and affordable electricity. We need a Secretary who is going to emphatically push the Trump administration in the proper direction. That is exactly what we wanted to hear from Governor Perry in the Energy committee. Four members of the committee asked about his commitment to these programs. Unfortunately, the nominee dodged the questions. I followed up with Governor Perry after his confirmation hearing, and he still failed to provide a commitment to fight for these important programs. So I regret that I will not be able to support this nominee.

We need to make sure that the United States will continue to support the R&D, the scientists, the investments in electric grid modernization, and the investments in cyber security that are going to help make our Nation safe and our economy strong. I urge my colleagues to oppose this nomination, and I hope that we can move forward on making sure that we have an aggressive energy strategy for the future.

With that, I see my colleague from Washington. I would like to yield some time to her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Washington State, who has made a really important case. I want to be here today to add my opinion, as well, because over the past 2 months we have heard a lot about President Trump's plan to drain the swamp, which is to reject special interests and the corporate elite and, instead, fight for workers across our country.

There are a whole lot of claims, a whole lot of promises—all great. Fighting for workers is what this Congress should be doing, but the President's actions speak a lot louder than his words. I find it telling that we are here again debating yet another Cabinet nominee sent over from the White House—this time Gov. Rick Perry—whose interests have been more closely aligned with those of Big Oil and corporations rather than advancing our country's energy challenges or fighting for the working families we represent.

So let me be clear. If confirmed to head up the Department of Energy, Governor Perry would join the ranks of other unqualified candidates chosen by this President to lead critically important agencies with very specific and complex functions. It is a big job. I believe that getting the top spot at the Department of Energy—or anywhere else in the President's Cabinet—should not simply be a prize for demonstrating loyalty during an election.

Getting the job should be borne of a solid understanding of the agency, a respect for the tens of thousands of workers they would lead, and, most importantly, a commitment to putting families across the country first. So as a voice from my home State of Washington, where DOE's presence is extremely important, I will vote no on Governor Perry's nomination. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Washington State is home to the Hanford nuclear reservation near the Tri-Cities. Nearly 75 years ago, this region underwent a dramatic transformation, practically overnight and under top-secret conditions, to help the United States win World War II and later the Cold War.

Families and workers in this region of our State sacrificed immensely for the good of our country and the safety of our world. To this day, there is a massive environmental impact in the Tri-Cities created by decades of nu-

clear weapons production. Now this cleanup effort is vital, not only to the health and safety of families and workers and the economy in Central Washington but also for communities along the Columbia River.

As I have told anyone elected as President, whether Democrat or Republican, it is the Federal Government's moral and legal obligation and responsibility to clean up Hanford. I know that is not an easy feat, but it is essential. It requires a very deep understanding of a very large and complex cleanup project and a great deal of respect for the workers who show up each day to make progress on this massive project. I remain deeply concerned that Governor Perry and this administration fail to grasp what is at stake.

I am also concerned that they don't get the importance of another national asset not far from Hanford, the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. For more than 50 years, the men and women at PNNL have been on the forefront of scientific discovery. It was originally created to support research and development at Hanford, but PNNL has become DOE's premiere chemistry, environmental sciences, and data analytics national lab, tackling some of our Nation's most complex and urgent challenges.

PNNL is a leader in atmospheric research, nuclear detection and non-proliferation, and the Nation's electric grid. Its researchers have taken on everything from high-performance computing to advanced biofuels to analyzing lunar samples from NASA. These are critically important functions that advance our Nation.

I have worked hard with the entire Washington State congressional delegation, not to mention a whole host of leaders at the local and State level, to support this vital research and development hub and its incredible workforce. Just like the workers at Hanford, they also deserve leaders in this administration who respect and value their work. So, if President Trump were truly looking out for workers across our country, he would take this nomination to the Energy Department very seriously.

I understand Governor Perry gave his word during his confirmation hearing that he would work with us and even come to Washington State to visit Hanford and PNNL. If he is confirmed by the Senate, you can bet I will hold him to that because one I thing I have learned in the short 40-plus days of this administration is that we do get a lot of words. But it is the action that truly matters.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for coming to the floor and for her statement on this important issue. She and I are partners in making sure that Hanford waste is cleaned up. We so much want to continue to make progress on this important issue for our State. Having dealt

with previous Energy Secretaries, we know that it is always a fight to make sure that Hanford gets the priority it deserves, so I thank her for that.

I want to resume my comments about the key functions the Department of Energy performs and why it is vitally important that the agency succeeds in its missions, rather than be dismantled by a President who may not understand the significance of the work the Department does.

I am speaking specifically about the Department of Energy's programs to enhance our energy efficiency, promote renewable energy innovation, mobilize, modernize and bolster the security of our electricity grid, and continue to make significant advancements in science. I have spoken to Governor Perry on a couple of occasions, but, as I mentioned earlier, I failed to hear him commit to these essential DOE programs.

Our Nation's energy sector is undergoing an unbelievable transformation from fossil fuels. These changes are giving consumers more choice and lower energy bills and producing a more robust job-creation environment.

There are now 2.2 million Americans who work in the energy efficiency industry alone. In fact, energy efficiency accounted for 14 percent of all new jobs created in this country last year. That is an incredible number. We need to continue making investments in smart cars and smart buildings and homes of the future and how they are going to be integrated to reduce energy use and lower bills.

We just had a hearing this morning in the Commerce Committee and talked about broadband and white space and the continued development of the mobile economy and how we need to continue to take advantage of those advancements, particularly in rural communities.

The solar power workforce is also growing at a rapid rate. Last year, 1 out of every 50 new jobs in the United States was from solar power. The solar industry now employs more people than the oil and gas extraction or coal mining industries. These are important economic sectors.

In the last administration, the Energy Department's Quadrennial Energy Review estimated that 1.5 million new energy jobs will need to be filled, many of which will be in emerging energy technologies that will help define our clean energy economy. There are approximately 60,000 people in my home State of Washington who are employed in the clean energy sector. In fact, clean energy employment is growing twice as fast as the overall job rate in the State of Washington.

We have made too much progress, we have come too far in continuing to advance these important technologies to reverse course now. These advancements are going to help drive more savings and efficiency for consumers and businesses so they can be competitive. We must have leadership at the Depart-

ment of Energy making sure that progress continues.

I take Governor Perry at his word that he has now been fully briefed and he no longer believes the Department of Energy should be abolished. But his testimony raised questions about whether he will fight to protect the Department's essential programs from ideologues in a Trump administration that want to defund and eliminate these programs.

To better understand these challenges, let's briefly review the history. Just before the President was elected, the transition team's energy group sent a memo outlining 14 energy and environmental initiatives the new administration would be pushing. The memo pointed out that the Trump administration was going to eliminate and rescind and relax several Obama administration initiatives that are important to energy efficiency, important to reducing greenhouse gases, and require agencies to take the costs associated with climate into account. Shortly afterwards, the transition team sent an unprecedented questionnaire to the Energy Department, targeting scientists and civil servants who worked on these issues and asked the Obama administration to identify them.

The morning of Governor Perry's hearing, we awoke to news that the President's team was working on a proposal to eliminate the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and the Office of Electricity. So all those jobs I previously mentioned that are key in my State, key in the United States, and, I guarantee you, key to the U.S. economy's competitiveness in the future, would be at risk. Driving down the cost of electricity and keeping our businesses competitive is key to our Nation's economic strategy. I know that as a Senator who comes from a State with very affordable electricity. It has built our economy over and over and over and over again.

If you think about how our manufacturers have to compete in a global economy and look at where some of the manufacturing has gone or where our competition exists, these issues of cost-effective and efficient energy are key to our competitiveness as a nation.

We have seen in the State of California unbelievable results from energy efficiency. It is far cheaper to save a kilowatt of energy than it is to produce one, and this key factor is what has made California the leader in our Nation in energy efficiency and helped California businesses to be competitive. So we do not want to eliminate the Office of Energy Efficiency or the Office of Electricity.

As I said earlier, we tried to get Governor Perry to take a solid stance on these issues and commit wholeheartedly to fighting any attempt to do away with these important offices, but he failed to make a commitment.

During the President's very first hour in office, the administration announced it was going to eliminate the

Obama administration's climate action plan. This plan even included a program started by President George H.W. Bush—the Global Climate Research Initiative to assess and predict the impacts of climate change in the future.

This is not a partisan issue. President George W. Bush called on Congress to enact energy efficiency legislation, which he subsequently signed into law, and based on bipartisan energy legislation passed in 2005 and 2007, we improved lighting efficiency by 70 percent and increased fuel efficiency standards for automobiles. So I don't understand why the Trump administration is apparently so hostile to energy efficiency.

The Energy Department's energy efficiency programs are expected to save American consumers \$2 trillion on their utility bills by 2030 and reduce carbon emissions by 7.3 billion tons over the same period. That is equivalent to taking 1.6 billion cars off the road. The fact that businesses could save \$2 trillion by reducing their utility bills in the future is something we should all be passionate about. Our manufacturing base needs to remain competitive.

In addition, the Bush administration worked to get the United States and China—the two biggest greenhouse gas emitters—to work together on clean energy solutions. President Bush also chose in his State of the Union Address to be an advocate for energy efficiency, electric vehicles, biofuels, R&D, and a clean energy economy. I now appreciate even more now how much he advocated for those programs. It seems strange now to see a new Republican administration that seems so single-mindedly against these important energy advancements that are going to help our economy.

The Department of Energy also plays an essential role in protecting the electric grid from cyber and physical attacks. The Office of Electricity plays a very key role for our Nation, and, as we know, there is a full-throated debate about what cyber security attacks can do to the United States of America.

These issues about how some regime could undermine our U.S. democracy are critical. We need to address it, and we need to be aggressive as a nation about it.

The Office of Electricity plays a key role, and we want the Department of Energy to be aggressive in asserting its leadership on cyber security. If you are not committed to the Office of Electricity, if you are not committed to these vital programs, how are you going to be committed to protecting us on cyber security?

It should not have been difficult for Governor Perry to speak more urgently about these programs or to say he disagreed with the administration's reported desire to cut them. For instance, he spoke eloquently about energy diversification and pointed us to his record as Governor. But, as I looked

back at his record, I noticed that he tried to add 11 new coal plants, 8 of which were subsequently canceled after a court overturned his executive order expediting the coal permitting process. This is the kind of leadership we cannot afford at the Department of Energy. That is not about holding on to the past; we need a plan for the future.

Finally, I want to mention President Trump's recent Executive order regarding the National Security Council. While it is within the discretion of the President to structure his National Security Council as he sees fit, the Secretary of Energy is a member of the National Security Council by virtue of statute. The President's Executive order removed the Secretary of Energy from the principals committee and what under the Obama administration was called the senior interagency forum for considering policy issues that affect the national security interests of the United States.

I can guarantee you that energy is an issue of national security. We need leadership out of the Department of Energy to be strategic on electricity, transmission, and cyber security.

The Department of Energy's technical expertise is vast and is not limited to the implementation of the Iran deal. The Department plays a key role on nuclear security issues.

I take the Governor at his word that he will come to Hanford, that he will look for funding to make sure that cleanup happens, and I take him at his word that he does want to work with Members of Congress.

Unfortunately, his unwillingness to commit to critical offices at the Department that are responsible for important scientific research, giving our government and our communities more data and information about climate science, making the investments we need in our electricity grid of the future, is something that concerns me about his nomination. I cannot support Governor Perry.

I know so much will get boiled down to this sound bite of him being the nominee of an agency that he said he wanted to abolish and then, at the same time, could not even remember the agency. I guarantee you, the Energy Department is a vital, functioning program not just for today's energy needs, but as the quadrennial review said, for our future energy needs.

So we could have an Energy Secretary who is going to help us with the transformation, protecting us on cyber security, making sure our businesses reap the benefits of greater energy efficiency, and, when it comes to the electricity grid of the future, making sure we plan for those 1.5 million jobs that are going to be needed. But those aren't the commitments we have had from Governor Perry.

I hope my colleagues will recognize that this nomination is not the direction the Department of Energy needs to go in and oppose Governor Perry for the Department of Energy.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, as recently as 2006, Hawaii relied on imported fuel for 92 percent of our energy needs. This was bad for our economy and bad for our environment, and it needed to change. Today, Hawaii has the most ambitious renewable energy goals in the country, and we are working toward becoming 100 percent energy self-sufficient for electricity by 2045. In order to meet this ambitious goal, we are investing in a renewable energy future. It means cleaner air and water to enjoy, and it is driving a lot of local innovation. Let me give you a few examples.

Last Friday, I attended a blessing for a new biofuel project in Maui's central valley. Pacific Biodiesel, run by Bob and Kelly King, is repurposing 115 acres of land previously used for commercial sugar cultivation in order to test the energy potential of different sunflower varieties for biofuels. If they are successful, this project could grow to provide hundreds of jobs on the island and help Hawaii on its path to energy self-sufficiency.

Bob and Kelly got their start in repurposing used cooking oil. They have grown their company to run the Nation's first commercially viable biodiesel distillery on Hawaii Island, and they employ 80 people. Along the way, they have received support and funding through the Hawaii Military Biofuels Crop Program, which has allowed them to experiment, learn from their mistakes, and, ultimately, succeed.

Yesterday, I met with Naveen Sikka, the founder and CEO of TerViva, which is a startup that grows pongamia trees that produce an oil seed that can be used for biofuels. In working with Hawaii's Energy Excelsator, TerViva is already growing pongamia trees on 200 acres on Oahu and is looking to expand its operations across the State.

TerViva and Pacific Biodiesel are working together to explore how to help Hawaii achieve its renewable energy goals.

In 2015, I met with Global Algae Innovations, a company that is pioneering the production of algae for use in biofuels on Kauai. Funding from the Department of Energy, or DOE, has been instrumental in its research. Support from the Department is vital in helping them and other algae biofuel companies finish scaling up commercial production at competitive prices.

These stories provide a compelling counternarrative to the President's belief that we should prioritize fossil fuel extraction over renewable energy development. These stories also demonstrate the role government can play in encouraging energy innovation.

During the Obama administration, our country made significant progress in confronting the challenge of climate change, investing in clean energy research and development, and growing our renewable energy economy. Unfor-

tunately, by nominating Rick Perry to serve as Secretary of Energy, the President is sending a clear signal. Instead of continuing the progress we have made, he wants to take us backward.

During his confirmation hearing, Governor Perry insisted that he believed in an "all of the above" energy strategy. So far, it does not seem that the President shares his commitment.

During the transition, a disturbing report leaked in the media that outlined the President's plans to make dramatic funding cuts at the Department of Energy. This extreme plan included eliminating the DOE's Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, which focuses on the transition to American energy generation that is clean, affordable, and secure, not to mention sustainable. The plan would eliminate the DOE's Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, which ensures the Nation's energy delivery system is secure, resilient, and reliable. This office works to strengthen the resiliency of the electric grid. The plan would also eliminate the DOE's Office of Fossil Energy, which focuses on technology to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

It is hard to see how it would be possible to pursue an "all of the above" energy strategy if so much of the Department's "all of the above" capabilities are eliminated.

I asked Governor Perry, during his confirmation hearing, whether he supported those proposed cuts and program eliminations within the Department that he was nominated to head. His response was telling. Governor Perry said: "Well, Senator, maybe they'll [meaning the Trump administration] have the same experience I had and forget that they said that."

Remember, Governor Perry had originally said that the Department of Energy should be eliminated. Governor Perry's "oops" answer got a laugh at the hearing, but it failed to convince me that he has the willingness and fortitude to stand up to the Trump White House on its energy policies.

I also asked Governor Perry if Hawaii could count on his support in our efforts to become energy independent and a leader in the clean energy economy. Again, Governor Perry said yes, but in the same transition memo, the Trump White House proposed eliminating the DOE's Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy entirely, as I mentioned before. It is unclear how Governor Perry could keep his commitment to the State of Hawaii and to me if the entire office that is responsible for renewable energy is eliminated.

Many of my constituents share my concerns about Governor Perry. Charlotte from Wailuku wrote to me:

Please do not confirm Rick Perry for US Secretary of Energy. He is not a visionary leader. In Hawaii, we have committed to being 100% carbon emission free by 2045.

Rick Perry is not the person who can help provide innovation, funding or the tools needed to make this happen.

I share Charlotte's concerns. We have made so much progress over the past 8 years in embracing a clean and renewable energy future, and Governor Perry and the Trump administration will work to reverse this progress and take us backward.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to explain my opposition to the nominations of Ryan Zinke to be Secretary of the Interior and Rick Perry to be the Secretary of Energy. I have closely reviewed their records, testimony, and responses to questions for the record.

CONFIRMATION OF RYAN ZINKE

Madam President, the Secretary of the Interior is one of the most important jobs in the Federal Government and has a far reach when it comes to coordinating our Federal policy in the 50 States and U.S. Territories for our public lands, parks, and cherished natural resources. The Secretary and the Department of Interior are tasked with using sound science to manage and sustain America's lands, water, wildlife, and energy resources, while honoring our Nation's vital obligations and responsibilities to tribal nations. The Secretary of Interior also coordinates Federal assistance to the Freely Associated States of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau under the Compacts of Free Association. There are few Cabinet positions with such a wide range of management and organization.

Any nominee for this position should be selected for their commitment to protecting our precious resources, as well as their dedication to uphold and enforce our environmental laws.

After reviewing Mr. Zinke's record, there is little doubt that he is dedicated to public service and that he has a strong connection to the outdoors. However, the Secretary of the Interior has a great responsibility as the leading steward of our majestic public lands, the champion of our great tribal nations, and the manager and defender of our diverse wildlife. I fear that Mr. Zinke may not be fully prepared to set aside some of his personal views on the management of our resources and consider the views of all Americans as we debate critical natural resources issues.

I enjoyed learning that Mr. Zinke is an admirer of President Teddy Roosevelt, a point that has been repeated countless times, and I was pleased that he agrees that, yes, President Roosevelt did get it right when he placed millions of acres of lands under Federal protection. However, I hope that Mr. Zinke will not only study the work that President Roosevelt did to instill a conservation ethic in this country, but will look more broadly at other individuals whose steadfast commitment and dedication to conservation and historic preservation have left their mark in Vermont and across the country.

For instance, Laurance Rockefeller made significant contributions to the American conservation movement that had a lasting impact on the American landscape. The Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in Woodstock, VT, honors not only Rockefeller's dedication to conservation, but is also the first national park to tell the story of conservation history and the evolving nature of land stewardship in America. Conservation of the environment and recreational development was a passion to which he dedicated his life. In addition to his work in Vermont, he was instrumental in the creation and development of the Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming and the Virgin Islands National Park on the island of St. John. These three national parks could not be more different, but they are each spectacular pieces of our natural heritage. This heritage that would not exist today and be available for the public to enjoy, had it not been for the vital work of Laurance Rockefeller and the Federal investments that have been made in these important public lands.

I hope Mr. Zinke will also study and hopefully visit the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, which carves its way not only through Vermont, but 13 other States as well. This trail is an amazing footpath for the people that traverses over 2,100 miles through wild forests, towns, valleys, and mountaintops, and connects a myriad of through-hikers and day hikers to our scenic landscape. All of them are able to enjoy the important Federal investments in this trail, which is maintained by the countless hours of work done every year by devoted volunteers like the Green Mountain Club in Vermont.

Work to build and maintain the Appalachian Trail is not static, nor is it complete. There continue to be important investments needed through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, LWCF, to acquire land and conservation easements to safeguard the trail. There is much needed trail maintenance that should be included as part of any infrastructure bill the Senate considers. This work is shovel-ready and will have a considerable impact in supporting our outdoor economy on which Vermont is so dependent.

Mr. Zinke should also seek out expertise and guidance from the past Secretaries of the Interior who have dedicated their lives to this work. I hope he will study the exit memo that Secretary Jewell prepared on the Department's Record of Progress and the moral imperative the Department has to positively impact our American economy, our rural communities and cities, and ultimately, the well-being of our planet.

As Secretary of Interior, Mr. Zinke will oversee a number of ongoing debates concerning our fragile public lands, the protection of endangered species, and how we respond to climate change. I know that there is no single

solution that can answer the different land management issues facing each region of our country. Many stakeholders are constantly engaging the Interior Department and the Senate with a wide variety of views on how we should protect, access, and use our natural resources. In Vermont, we are deeply concerned about the pressure being placed on our natural resources from rapid growth and climate change.

I heard from hundreds of Vermonters concerned about Mr. Zinke's nomination and worried that our environmental standards and laws will not be enforced for our lands, air, water, and threatened species under his leadership. His record has shown an opposition to policies that protect valuable rivers and streams from polluting coal runoff and a willingness to weaken historic laws such as President Teddy Roosevelt's Antiquities Act. He even authored a bill that sought to obstruct efforts by the Department of the Interior to review and modernize management of our Federal energy resources and ensure that taxpayers are fairly compensated for their sale. Taxpayers deserve a Secretary of the Interior who will work to support the protection of our shared Federal resources 100 percent of the time, not one who will actively work to weaken or dismantle the powers of protection invested in this Department.

Based on that record, I voted against his nomination. Nonetheless, now that Mr. Zinke is the Secretary, I want him to know that I am committed to working closely with him on a variety of issues that are important to Vermonters and all Americans. I will work with him to foster consensus not only in New England, but throughout the country. As the Vice Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I am committed to working with him to ensure that we protect our Federal lands and continue the important conservation ethic of Teddy Roosevelt to permanently protect our beautiful and fragile natural resources, while also addressing new challenges posed by climate change.

Madam President, with respect to the nomination of Rick Perry to be the Secretary of the Department of Energy, hundreds of Vermonters have written to me in opposition. They were concerned that under his leadership we will halt the forward progress we have made towards a responsible energy strategy for the future of our country. Not only did Governor Perry make headlines for famously proposing to abolish the Department of Energy, he lacks a background or any true experience on the complex scientific and technical issues in the Department of Energy's portfolio. This agency must be focused on addressing our energy and environmental challenges through transformative science and technology solutions; yet Mr. Perry expedited the permitting of coal-fired electric generating plants and filed suit challenging

the Environmental Protection Agency's finding that greenhouse gases significantly endanger public health. How can we trust him to lead the Energy Department?

I was pleased that, during his confirmation hearing, Governor Perry apologized for suggesting that the entire Department of Energy should be abolished. However, he has yet to say that he will fight to maintain important offices within the Department, such as the Office of Electricity and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. I find it hard to see how we can pursue an "all-of-the-above" energy strategy called for by the administration if so much of the Department's capabilities are targeted for elimination. By supporting research around wind, solar, and efficiency, offering loan guarantees for innovative demonstration projects, and providing expertise and support to the private sector in commercializing new research we can create American jobs and grow the national economy. Conversely, if we turn our back on the future, we are ceding these important and fast growing fields of research and production of renewable energy technologies to China, the European Union, and other countries at a critical time. That would be a monumental mistake to haunt our economy for many years.

Earlier today, I had the chance to talk to a Vermont company that is closely watching the work of the Energy Department to advance America's clean energy revolution. Northern Power Systems in Barre, VT, has been designing and developing wind turbines for almost 40 years and offers support services for energy generation needs around the world. Last year, they received an award for their increase in exports, but rather than selling to an international market they would rather see their sales here in the U.S. take off so that they can create more American jobs to manufacture American-made wind turbines. Turbines that should be installed here to utilize this reliable, abundant, and free resource to lower energy costs for Americans.

It is troubling that Mr. Perry has taken such an aggressive stance against the Department of Energy and dismissed large parts of its mission. I hope that he will devote himself to learning everything he can about the diverse work of the Department and surround himself with some of the best public servants and technical experts he can find.

The last Secretary of Energy, Dr. Ernest Moniz, prepared two documents that I am hopeful Mr. Perry will study closely. First, the Quadrennial Energy Review provides a broad review of federal energy policy in the context of economic, environmental, occupational, security, and health and safety priorities. The Department also prepared an extensive suite of analyses to accompany the Quadrennial Energy Review that I know would serve Mr. Perry well as he tries to understand

the wide array of issues that will come before him at the Department.

I would also recommend that he review the exit memo Secretary Moniz prepared, which highlights the responsibilities and opportunities for the Department's enduring service to the Nation as our leading science, technology, and innovation agency. The Department has an extraordinary span of responsibilities from energy and the environment, to cyber security, science and national security, and it must collaborate with other agencies like the Defense Department and our intelligence community.

I remain committed to supporting and protecting the essential mission of the Department of Energy in order to move us forward with 21st century jobs and make needed investments in our electricity grid, clean energy, and energy efficiency that will save American consumers and businesses money.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I am strongly opposed to the nomination of Rick Perry to be the Secretary of Energy.

While Governor Perry has a long record of public service, he is the wrong choice to lead the Department of Energy. He does not possess the technical expertise or necessary qualifications. Moreover, his past statements calling for the elimination of the Department and questioning the science behind climate change, coupled with his reported lack of understanding about the scope of the Department's responsibilities, call into question his ability to lead an agency that is so critical to our national and economic security.

What Governor Perry learned during this confirmation process is that the Secretary of Energy not only oversees our country's energy initiatives and strategies, but is also the steward of our nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA, a part of the Department of Energy, ensures the safety, security, and effectiveness of our nuclear weapons. The NNSA brings together exceptionally dedicated men and women from our Armed Forces to work alongside some of our best scientists and engineers to provide expert advice in nuclear nonproliferation and counterterrorism. The Secretary of Energy must understand their work and advise the President on our nuclear arsenal capabilities and national security issues. Governor Perry has no experience in these areas and is not qualified to lead the agency tasked with maintaining our nuclear deterrent.

The Department of Energy also protects our Nation's security by strengthening the electrical grid's resilience in the face of natural disaster and cyber attacks. Its Office of Electricity works with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and utilities to protect the electrical grid; yet the Trump administration has reportedly proposed eliminating this office, something which Governor Perry has not sought to dispel.

The Department of Energy leads the country and the world in renewable energy generation and energy efficiency. For my home State of Rhode Island, renewable energy from the wind, sun, and ocean is not just a path to local energy production, but also a source of well-paying jobs ranging from steelworkers to scientists. Last year, Rhode Island became the first State to build an offshore wind farm, off the coast of Block Island, proving that offshore wind can be a viable renewable energy source for the United States.

This technological feat could not have been accomplished without the science, engineering, and policy research supported by the Office of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency. This office drives the research in wind, solar, geothermal, and ocean energy that has made affordable renewable energy a reality. However, Governor Perry, in his written responses, refused to comment on reports that the administration would cut funding, or even worse, eliminate this vital department. Failure to invest in this department and its research risks our future as an energy-producing nation.

We need a Secretary of Energy who also can effectively manage the Office of Science and the National Laboratories, programs that have made the United States a global leader in scientific advancement since the Manhattan project. The National Laboratory system hosts equipment far beyond the capabilities of most universities or companies—such as massive particle accelerators, powerful supercomputers, and high-temperature laser ignition facilities—that are vital to expanding our knowledge base and technological advancement.

The future of many of these energy science programs in the new administration is of great concern to the scientific community. The same budget recommendations that would eliminate the Office of Electricity also showed plans to cut supercomputing research, even as China is making large investments to become the world leader in this area. Advanced computing is vital to national defense and economic competitiveness. Shortsighted budget cuts here, or in any of our basic research programs, threaten our Nation's future security and prosperity. Governor Perry has not pledged to protect or prioritize any of these programs.

The Department of Energy's leadership in atmospheric science and climate change is also threatened. The Trump administration has gone beyond merely ignoring the threat of climate change; it has proposed cutting off funding to the critical programs that monitor our planet. It has also cast doubt that climate data will be accessible and available to the public and other researchers. We have already seen an unprecedented attempt by the Trump transition team to collect the names of scientists who study the consequences of carbon dioxide emissions. It appears that, for the first time in

the history of the agency, its scientists are worried that honestly reporting their findings may be a career-ending decision.

This is an alarming assault on the integrity of American science. The Secretary of Energy must be someone who understands science and will protect the government scientists who work in the national interest. The Secretary must understand and be able to present to the President the overwhelming scientific consensus that the climate is changing and that human activities are responsible. All Governor Perry committed to do in this and other areas is to learn more about the science.

This is not sufficient.

We have been fortunate that recent occupants of this post were not learning basic science on the job. Both Presidents Bush and Obama filled this post with experts possessing a deep understanding of science and technological issues. President Bush appointed Dr. Samuel Bodman, who served as a member of MIT's faculty before moving into business and government. President Obama appointed a Nobel prize winner in physics, Dr. Steven Chu, and a MIT physicist, Dr. Ernest Moniz. The result is that, for the past 12 years, the Department of Energy has been well equipped to respond to challenges in national security, energy, and science.

We need a Secretary of Energy who can build on that legacy. We need a Secretary of Energy who has the technical expertise to oversee our Nation's nuclear stockpile, the integrity to protect basic science from political attacks, and the willingness to fight for a secure grid and renewable energy technology. I am not convinced that Governor Perry has those qualifications.

For these reasons, I cannot support his nomination. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I will vote against confirming former Texas Governor Rick Perry as Secretary of Energy. There are too many policies he promoted while he was governor that cause concern. He refuses to accept scientific consensus regarding human causes of climate change. His support for clean energy and energy efficiency seems tenuous, at best, and he is in lock-step with the Trump administration's desire to boost fossil fuel production at the expense of human health and the environment.

Governor Perry, while campaigning for the Republican nomination for President in 2012, proposed abolishing the agency he has now been nominated to run. I appreciate his candor and honesty in repudiating that position and acknowledging that he really didn't understand the Department of Energy's mission at the time. He has served our Nation and Texas as an Air Force pilot, a member of the Texas House of Representatives, the Texas Agriculture Commissioner, and the Lieutenant Governor and Governor of Texas.

A key part of DOE's mission has been to promote clean and advanced energy

technologies, via grants for research and development, and through the work of 17 national laboratories. In response to growing global demand for clean energy solutions, DOE under the leadership of Secretaries Steven Chu and Ernest Moniz launched initiatives to expand the global reach of DOE's clean and advanced energy missions.

In 2009, then-Energy Secretary Chu announced that he would host the first Clean Energy Ministerial, CEM, to bring together ministers with responsibility for clean energy technologies from the world's major economies and ministers from a select number of smaller countries that are leading in various areas of clean energy.

The CEM is a high-level global forum to promote policies and programs that advance clean energy technology, to share lessons learned and best practices, and to encourage the transition to a global clean energy economy. Previous CEMs have yielded remarkable national pledges from both the United States and foreign governments to develop and deploy clean energy technologies which in the aggregate have played a significant role in improving the global market competitiveness of clean and renewable energy technologies.

DOE also serves as the linchpin of the U.S. pledge to Mission Innovation, a global initiative involving 20 nations aimed at doubling public clean energy research and development.

The program, spearheaded by President Barack Obama and French President Francois Hollande with private sector support from Bill Gates via the Breakthrough Energy Coalition. The current U.S. Government investment portfolio of more than \$5 billion spans the full range of research and development activities—from basic research to demonstration activities, RD&D. The U.S. Government investment portfolio includes programs at 11 agencies, with the largest investment at DOE. These programs address a broad suite of low carbon technologies, including end-use energy efficiency, renewable energy, nuclear energy, electric grid technologies, carbon capture and storage, advanced transportation systems, and fuels.

At DOE, these programs are implemented through a number of mechanisms including cost-shared projects with the private sector research and development activities at the National Laboratories, grants to universities, and support for collaborative research centers targeted to key energy technology frontiers. The next planned phase for Mission Innovation, as envisioned by former Energy Secretary Moniz, was developing an international clean energy consortia, based on the principle of sharing institutional and technological resources to deploy shared energy solutions across international boundaries. The goal was to bring countries of all sizes together to develop, produce, and deploy clean energy solutions, with our 17 National

Research Laboratories at the center of this results-oriented partnership.

Unfortunately, all of this investment and America's ability to lead and profit from the clean energy revolution is in jeopardy. There is no credible reason to believe that former Governor Perry or President Trump appreciate the U.S. interest in growing clean energy research and cooperation. President Trump deliberately ignores the significant growth of solar energy in the U.S. Human health, the environment, and America's global competitiveness will suffer as a result of this backwards ideological outlook on U.S. energy research, development, and production.

There were significant investments in wind energy in west Texas while Mr. Perry was Governor, but he also tried to fast-track 11 new coal-fired power plants in the State, a plan the courts ultimately scrapped.

During Mr. Perry's two unsuccessful runs for the Republican Presidential nomination in 2012 and 2016, he consistently recited popular tropes coined by climate change denialists. For instance, in his book, "Fed Up" former Governor Perry called the science behind climate change a "contrived, phony mess." During his 2012 campaign, former Governor Perry accused climate scientists of manipulating data in order to receive funding for their projects. While he was Governor, his administration deleted all references to climate change from a report about sea level rise in Galveston Bay.

I am also concerned that, during the Perry administration, Texas dropped from 11th down to 27th in the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy's ranking of State energy efficiency policies. Under his watch, Texas filed suit in 2012 challenging the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's finding that greenhouse gases significantly endanger public health.

Under his watch, Texas sued EPA a dozen times between 2008 and 2011.

According to press reports, the Trump administration may eliminate several DOE offices, including the Office of Electricity and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

Former Governor Perry was asked about these reports during his confirmation hearing but didn't commit to fighting for the offices or the vital programs they administer.

Former Governor Perry was also an active member of the Outer Continental Shelf Governors Coalition, OCSGC. While the OCSGC supports offshore wind development, its primary purpose is to promote oil and gas production on OCS lands, including the mid-Atlantic, and expand revenue sharing for interested States. So States to the south of Maryland may push for OCS oil and gas production and reap increased benefits from it at the expense of all taxpayers. But if there is an oil spill that hits Maryland's coastline and enters the Chesapeake Bay, it will be our fishing and tourism industries that suffer.

For all of these reasons, I will vote against confirming former Governor Rick Perry as Secretary of Energy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I oppose the nomination of Governor Rick Perry to be Secretary of the Department of Energy, a Department that he called for eliminating in 2011. After briefings on the Department's mission and programs, Governor Perry came to "regret" that position, but his short education on his prospective job is not enough to prepare him for its complexity and importance.

The Department of Energy is a home of innovation and, critically, the Federal agency that manages the safety and reliability of our nuclear arsenal. The last two Secretaries of Energy were physicists.

According to the Dallas Morning News: "In all of the department's missions, science is front and center. But during his 14 years as governor, Perry built a questionable record when it comes to science. He has a pattern of supporting offbeat medical theories while dismissing the established science on climate change. And his record of using public funds to boost technology and research in Texas is littered with poor management and allegations of cronyism."

In one example, a 2010 Dallas Morning News investigation discovered mismanagement and political influence in the Texas Emerging Technology Fund, which Governor Perry established to provide funding to high-tech startups. The Dallas Morning News reported that the fund awarded more than \$16 million to companies with connections to large campaign donors. A company in which an old college friend and donor invested received \$2.75 million. Another company, where an investor had given more than \$400,000 to Governor Perry's campaigns, received \$1.5 million. A company founded by a former Perry appointee got \$4.5 million.

The Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and the Texas House Speaker made the Emerging Technology Fund's decisions based on input from an advisory committee that operated in secret and did not take minutes. Its recommendations to the Governor were not public. This unusual decision-making process, with ultimate power vested in elected officials rather than technical experts, is deeply troubling. As Secretary of Energy, Governor Perry would be charged with managing a number of grant and loan programs aimed at developing the next generation of energy technologies.

Governor Perry has also failed to commit to funding for ARPA-E and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. These programs are essential to ensuring that the United States is a leader in the 21st century energy economy and confronts the critical challenge of climate change.

I am deeply concerned by Governor Perry's limited experience with our Nation's nuclear program. While he did advocate a low-level nuclear waste re-

pository in his State, he has no experience with nuclear weapons. His inexperience is particularly problematic when the President he would serve has also appeared confused by issues surrounding the nuclear triad and has inaccurately said that the United States has "fallen behind on nuclear weapons capacity."

The United States is engaged in a \$1 trillion program to refurbish our nuclear weapons systems, a process that should be tightly controlled. We should be reducing, not expanding, the number of nuclear weapons in the world. President Trump has questioned the New START Treaty, a critical tool to decrease nuclear weapons in both the United States and Russia. He glibly and irresponsibly called for "an arms race," even though the United States and Russia already control 95 percent of the world's nuclear weapons and each have enough to destroy the world many times over.

The Secretary of Energy needs to have a clear vision to manage our nuclear arsenal and ensure that the President fully understands our capabilities and their implications for national security and international peace. There is nothing in Governor Perry's record or testimony that indicates that he is prepared for this job.

Governor Perry may have considered the Department of Energy insignificant enough to forget during his Presidential run, but its mission is essential to the safety and security of the American people. Between our national labs and research and loan programs, it fosters greater economic competitiveness and discovers new technologies to drive energy independence and solutions to climate change. I do not believe that Governor Perry is prepared to manage the Department and provide thoughtful counsel to the President, and thus I must vote against his nomination today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Georgia.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in defense of a dear colleague of ours who is now the Attorney General of our Nation, Jeff Sessions. He is my friend. More importantly, he is a former colleague of this very body. He is a man of integrity. He is a man of principle. I trust him, and I take him at his word.

Furthermore, he has repeatedly said just today that he will, in fact, recuse himself if and when it becomes appropriate. In my opinion, it is not appropriate right now, but if it ever were to become appropriate, he has said, without hesitation, that he would.

I have really never witnessed anything quite like this in my brief time here in the Senate. The last 2 years have been very interesting, but never have I seen the hypocrisy that we see going on around this one issue.

It is increasingly clear that the minority party is singularly focused on sabotaging this new administration at

every turn, and today is no exception. They have exercised procedural rules in the Senate time and again, beyond the intent of the Founders' design, in order to stop President Trump from even getting his team in place—his very Cabinet. Our President today, as we stand here in this well, cannot have a staff meeting because he doesn't have all of his Cabinet members in place.

As for the Cabinet members who have been confirmed, the minority party seems equally fixated on finding any red herring they can ultimately find to undermine the individual's character. We have literally reached the point where Members of this body are slandering former colleagues for having and taking the same opportunities afforded to them.

This morning, my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, tweeted that she had never, "EVER" met with or taken a call from the Russian Ambassador. But her own Twitter account proved that she has at least twice in the last 4 years.

Thirty Members of this body, as a matter of fact, met with a Russian Ambassador and Ambassadors from other nations in 2015 for a sales pitch on President Obama's deal with Iran. Many of them, including the senior Senator from Missouri, were open supporters at that time of candidates in the President's race.

In the process of this hypocrisy, the minority party is prohibiting us from taking action on legislation that would solve many of the problems that have manifested themselves over the previous 8 years.

Make no mistake, Russia is a traditional rival whose actions pose a definite threat to global security and even our own security here at home. Their actions over the last 8 years have helped destabilize Eastern Europe and the Middle East. It was the inaction and refusal to lead of the past administration—a policy that the minority party followed hook, line, and sinker—that created a power vacuum around the world and allowed this Russian resurgence.

I have said this repeatedly, and I am going to continue to do so. Until there is definite proof that Russians changed a single vote from Hillary Clinton to Donald Trump, I will be focused on one thing; that is, doing exactly what the American people sent us here to do. I encourage my colleagues to do the same, which is to not engage in political theater for the sake of partisan politics, but to work together to get America back to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Texas Independence Day.

One hundred eighty-one years ago, 59 delegates met in Independence Hall at Washington-on-the-Brazos to risk everything to make freedom a reality for generations of Texans to come.

Today, I continue on a tradition started by the late Senator John Tower and carried on by Members of the Texas delegation to read the words of a 26-year-old Lieutenant Colonel, William Barret Travis, who at the time was under siege by the forces of Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna.

On February 24, 1836, Travis penned the following immortal letter:

To the People of Texas & All Americans in the World—Fellow Citizens & compatriots—

I am besieged, by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continual Bombardment & cannonade for 24 hours & have not lost a man—The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, & our flag still waves proudly from the walls—I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism & of everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch—The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily & will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible & die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor & that of his country—Victory or Death.

Signed:

William Barret Travis.

That same love of “life, liberty, and property of the people” that spurred the Texans at the Alamo and throughout the revolution still lives in each Texan today.

I think it is particularly appropriate that right now this body will be confirming former Texas Gov. Rick Perry to be the Secretary of Energy. That is fitting to the spirit of freedom and independence of Texans.

Texans fought for it, they died for it, and we owe it to their sacrifice to carry the torch of freedom for future generations, and we will.

To all Texans: Happy Independence Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is reminded that it is a violation of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate to impute to another Senator or Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming of a Senator.

The Senator from Florida.

REMEMBERING DOUG COE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, America lost one of our best friends, well-known to us in the Washington, DC, area.

Doug Coe, a disciple of a fellow named Abraham Vereide, over a half century ago came from Oregon to minister the Gospel to the Government of the United States. He has been doing that for over a half a century.

Doug, well-known to us in the Congress for so many years, always was bringing other people to the fore, and he always stood in the back. He encouraged so many of us to have fellowship together, to meet with each other, especially to have a meal together, to enjoy each other, and to do this in the Spirit of the Lord, and particularly the Spirit of Jesus. Because of that, he made so many friends all over the world.

This was a man whose religion brought people together across religions, not dividing us, as is so often the case. In Doug's spirituality, he could bring people of all faiths together in unity and understanding through the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

I have just come from the cemetery where Doug has been laid to rest. He is so well-known around here in the spirit of President Eisenhower's suddenly calling up a couple of his friends in the Senate and saying: Please come down here and visit with me; this is the loneliest house in America. That started the annual Prayer Breakfast, and, of course, that Prayer Breakfast has been held ever since, once a year, with the President, the Congress, the President's Cabinet, the Vice President, the Joint Chiefs, the diplomatic corps. Now over 150 nations attend that annual National Prayer Breakfast. It is really an international Prayer Breakfast.

Just this past one that was held in the first week of February indeed had a couple of heads of state, including His Majesty King Abdallah of Jordan. You wonder, how could a Muslim, who traces his roots all the way back—his lineage—to the Prophet Mohammed come to a group celebrating a Prayer Breakfast that generally identifies with the Christian faith? Well, that is the unique unity of all of these Prayer Breakfasts that are handled and held all over the world.

The Abrahamic faiths coming from the original single God, from which the seed of Abraham had not only the Jewish religion, the Muslim religion, and the Christian religion—in that, Doug Coe found unity. So all of these years he spent organizing the National Prayer Breakfast.

Doug lived through this last one. He wasn't able to attend, but he was holding court over in Northern Virginia as so many of the international guests came to Washington for that annual celebration.

We just laid Doug to rest today. Tomorrow, there will be a memorial service for him at a huge megachurch to try to accommodate the size of the audience that will be there out in Northern Virginia.

When this Senator first came to Congress many, many years ago, Doug Coe was the one who came to me and said: What I want you to do is I want you to get two Democrats and two Republicans, and I want you all to come together each week—breakfast or lunch—meet faithfully, read the Scriptures, enjoy each other's company, and then pray together.

We did that faithfully for 10 of the 12 years I was in the Congress. One of our Members was elected to the Senate at the time, and therefore he arranged for us to have one of the hideaways. As a matter of fact, it was Senator Mark Hatfield's hideaway that we would meet in and have the luncheon so that if we had to go vote, we were close to the Senate Chamber for him or close to the House Chamber for us.

Over the years, what has happened is these little groups that meet in the House on Thursday morning and the Senate on Wednesday morning, faithfully, they have gone across the globe and started other Prayer Breakfasts. That is why there are over 150 nations that now come annually to the National Prayer Breakfast. That is all because of our friend Doug Coe.

Doug Coe was never up front speaking. It was the President and a guest speaker who was not a religious person. This year, we made an exception. The Senate invited the Senate Chaplain Barry Black to give the main address, other than the President's address. You never saw Doug Coe at the dais. Doug was always quietly in the background meeting, extending the hand of friendship, extending his love, representing the values he spoke.

The Good Book tells us a lot of stories about those values. It also indicates that as someone put it in the street language of today, I would rather see a sermon than hear one any day.

By the example Doug Coe lived, he taught us how to live. God bless you, Doug Coe. You have done so much for so many.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING SHERIFF RALPH E. OGDEN

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise with a heavy heart to mark the passing of a pillar of the Arizona law enforcement community. When people think of the Old West, they often picture a Stetson-wearing lawman sitting astride his horse, keeping watch over his community.

For generations of residents in Southwestern Arizona, that lawman was Yuma County Sheriff Ralph Ogden. With his towering frame and trademark mustache, Sheriff Ogden looked every bit the part. Despite having an imposing physical presence, Sheriff Ogden was a kind, compassionate man, beloved by his deputies and celebrated by his community.

After 4 years of distinguished service in the U.S. Marine Corps, Ralph Ogden began his 42-year law enforcement career as a dispatcher and a jailer in Parker, AZ. A dedicated public servant, he would eventually serve as chief deputy for 12 years. Ralph would go on to be elected to five consecutive terms as sheriff, with his 20-year tenure the longest ever in Yuma county history.

Sheriff Ogden always understood the importance of getting to know the community he served. He encouraged his employees to get involved in charities, religious groups, and service organizations. He valued teamwork. He recognized that no one can succeed on

their own. This philosophy of always having some other person's back was something he carried with him throughout his time in the sheriff's office, and it was reflected in the way he treated those around him.

I was fortunate to get to know Ralph over the last few years and learned a lot of what I know about the border and about law enforcement from that great man.

Sheriff Ogden was known to write personal birthday and anniversary cards for each of his employees, just to show that he valued their service and their friendship and to show they were important to him.

When asked about the benefits of serving law enforcement, Sheriff Ogden said that when you go home tired and beat after a long day, you sleep well knowing that you did some good. Sheriff Ralph Ogden did a lot of good. I know he is resting well.

I yield back my time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:35 p.m. all but 10 minutes of postcloture time, equally divided in the usual form, be considered expired on Executive Calendar No. 9, the nomination of Rick Perry to be Secretary of Energy, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, let me just say briefly, I couldn't be happier that my friend, the former Governor of the State of Texas, Rick Perry, will be confirmed here shortly as the next Energy Secretary.

I know, personally, as do 28 million Texans, that Rick Perry has dedicated his life to public service. He is best known perhaps for serving our State as Governor for a record 14 years. Before that, he served in the Air Force. He served as a State representative in the Texas Legislature. He was elected as our Agriculture commissioner, then served as Lieutenant Governor. As you can tell, the man was born to lead.

During his governorship, Texas became known throughout the country as the economic engine that could pull the train of the U.S. economy and could weather even the toughest national economic downturn. Under Governor Perry's leadership, the State promoted cutting-edge innovation and sensible regulation in order to foster an "all of the above" energy strategy that revolutionized the Texas energy landscape and the Texas economy. The

State became not just an oil and gas powerhouse but the top wind-producing State in the country. We really do believe in an "all of the above" strategy when it comes to energy.

In short, Rick Perry created an environment where all energy producers could not just succeed but really prosper, and that continues to serve the people of our State well.

Texans still benefit from policies that continue to create more energy options for families across our State. Put it another way, Governor Perry has a very strong track record when it comes to promoting energy in a way that makes everybody better off. I have no doubt Governor Perry will take to the rest of the country these same principles that led to the Texas success story, opening America to a new energy renaissance.

I look forward to voting to confirm him in just a few minutes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

CALLING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL COUNSEL

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in the minutes remaining before this vote, I want to briefly call attention to an impending constitutional crisis we are facing in this Chamber and in this country as a result of recent revelations coming to our attention, literally within the last 24 hours, about contacts between now-Attorney General Jeff Sessions, our former colleague, and the Russian Ambassador.

Nearly 2 months ago, my Judiciary colleagues and I were told by then-Senator Sessions—and the Presiding Officer is on the Judiciary Committee. We were told in no uncertain terms that he "did not have communications with the Russians," and we took him at his word.

Last night, we learned that Senator Sessions' statement was inaccurate. These inaccurate, possibly intentionally false, statements misled us. They misled me, personally, and I feel they failed to provide the whole truth about his communications with and ties to the Russians, likely on behalf of the Trump campaign. These contacts were in the midst of an unprecedented attack on our democracy, an act of cyber warfare against our democratic institution that not only violated our law but subverted our electoral process.

The potentially false statements on this topic by then-Senator Sessions were not only deeply relevant and critically important in their own right, but they leave us with the question: What else is missing or misleading in that testimony, and the consequential questions about his fitness to lead the Department of Justice must be answered.

Unless Attorney General Sessions can provide a credible explanation, his resignation will be necessary. Senator Sessions' false statements heighten my deep concern about credible allegations

that the Trump campaign, the transition team, and the administration officials have colluded with the Russian Government, not only in actions prior to the election but possibly since then in what may amount to a coverup. Unless the whole truth is uncovered—and if there is a coverup, truly the adage will be fulfilled that the coverup is as bad as the crime. The only way to deter Russian aggression and continued cyber attacks on our democracy is to uncover the truth and deter this kind of aggression in the future.

At the time of his meetings with the Russian Ambassador, Senator Sessions was chairman of the Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee. Ambassador Kislyak is, of course, the same individual whose repeated covert contacts with former LTG Michael Flynn, President Trump failed to disclose both to the American public and to his own Vice President. General Flynn's failure to make those disclosures led to his own termination as National Security Advisor.

Contacts between these two men would raise concerns under any circumstances, but Senator Sessions' decision to, in effect, conceal them makes them even more troubling. I use that word with regret because I sat in the committee hearing as he answered those questions, and, personally, I can reach no other conclusion than to say he must have intended to conceal them and hide them from us as committee members.

The Attorney General, who is the most important law enforcement official in our country, must be held to an even higher standard. The sudden disclosure that he met repeatedly with the Russian Ambassador after denying under oath any such contact, gives us all the more reason—indeed compelling evidence—that a special counsel is necessary, and necessary now, to investigate Russian ties and contacts with the Trump campaign.

I have called for such a special counsel or prosecutor for weeks now and led a letter with more than 10 of my colleagues asking that Attorney General Sessions designate such a special prosecutor.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I want to make sure we do have locked in at 1:45 a vote on confirmation of Rick Perry to be Secretary of Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We do.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. As long as I still have about a minute prior to that vote, I have no objection.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I will end my remarks within a minute.

In short, over the past weeks, I have called repeatedly for a special counsel. My view is that now-Attorney General Sessions must be brought back before the Judiciary Committee and provide an explanation. The lack of a credible explanation makes his resignation necessary, and his denial of contacts raises serious and troubling questions about the process that led to his confirmation. Absent swift action by a special counsel, evidence of this troubling conduct will be at high risk of concealment by the very agency, the Department of Justice, entrusted by the American people to seek and uncover the truth. An impartial, objective, comprehensive, and thorough investigation by a special prosecutor is unquestionably necessary now, and I hope we will have bipartisan support for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as we near the vote on the nomination of Governor Rick Perry to be our next Secretary of Energy, I want to again reiterate my support for his confirmation.

As I mentioned earlier, Governor Perry has devoted his life to public service. During his 14 years as Governor of Texas, he championed an "all of the above" energy strategy, and led his State to tremendous economic growth. He was a good steward of the environment as he worked to find ways to grow the economy and worked toward achieving major reductions in emission levels in the State of Texas.

As I said this morning, Governor Perry is a principled leader. He will set a good direction for the Department of Energy. I am confident he will pursue scientific discovery, promote innovation, be a good steward of our nuclear weapons stockpile, and make progress on the cleanup of our legacy sites, which we recognize are very important. He will help us build the infrastructure we need to become a global energy superpower and partner with States, like my State of Alaska, that suffer from very high energy costs.

He has a strong record. Governor Perry gets results. He is a competent manager and I think a proven leader. I am pleased to be able to support his confirmation. I know Members from both sides of the aisle agree. I think he will be a good addition to our new President's Cabinet, and I would urge that all Members support his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, speaking in opposition to the Perry nomination, I would say this: We need an Energy Secretary for the 21st century, one who will help protect us by fighting for an electricity grid that will make our entire Internet economy more reliable and safe from cyber attacks. We need someone who is invested in an energy efficiency strategy

that will save our businesses money and make them competitive.

The last two Presidents made energy efficiency a key priority—President Bush by advocating for plug-in vehicles and energy efficiency legislation and President Obama, who made a major investment in the smart grid and made energy efficiency and creating clean energy jobs a top priority for the Nation.

Governor Perry has not committed to those same principles, to move us forward into the 21st century energy economy. We don't want this part of our economy to be left behind to our international competitors.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Perry 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Stabenow
Corker	Kennedy	Strange
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Van Hollen
Coons	Markley	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote on the

nomination, and I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

DISAPPROVING A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, AND THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 37 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schumer
Cantwell	Hirono	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Stabenow
Carper	King	Tester
Casey	Klobuchar	Udall
Coons	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markley	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—3

Isakson Leahy Schatz

The motion was agreed to.