

the 10 hours of debate on the existing House bill and then putting a substitute in—the Senate bill they have written behind closed doors—and have no debate on that? With everything terrible that is happening, that could make it even worse. So I am asking the majority leader to publicly state what his plan is in that regard.

I have never heard of a more radical or a more reckless process in my entire career in politics—10 hours of total debate on a bill that would affect one-sixth of the American economy and millions of Americans. If the Senate bill, like the House bill, results in 23 million fewer Americans with insurance—23 million Americans losing their insurance—each hour of debate time would represent 2.3 million Americans losing their insurance. Each minute of debate time would represent 40,000 Americans losing their insurance. One minute, and 40,000 people's lives are changed; 40,000 people don't have the coverage they need.

It boggles the mind that the Republican leader is moving forward this way without letting anyone but Members of the Republican Senate caucus see the bill, and even many of them have said they haven't seen it. There is only one possible reason why my friends on the other side are going along with this process—only one reason: They are ashamed of the bill they are writing.

If they were proud of the bill, they would announce it. They would have brass bands going down Main Street America, saying: Look at our great bill. They can't even whisper what it is about, they are so, so ashamed of it. That is why they are hiding it. They must be ashamed that, just like the House bill, the Senate TrumpCare bill will put healthcare out of the reach of millions of Americans just to put another tax break into the pockets of the very wealthy.

President Trump likes to end many of his tweets with one word, almost like punctuation: "Sad," "unfair," "wrong." It turns out the President has one word to sum up his healthcare plan as well: "Mean."

Last week, at a White House lunch with Republican Senators, the President reportedly told them he thought the House-passed healthcare bill was mean. That is what Donald Trump said on June 13, 2017.

For once, on the topic of healthcare, I find myself agreeing with the President. His healthcare bill is mean. Cutting Medicaid to the bone is mean. Cutting treatment for opioid abuse is mean. Cutting support for families with someone in a nursing home is mean. Allowing insurers to once again discriminate against Americans with preexisting conditions is mean. Charging older Americans five times or more for their health insurance is mean.

Passing a law which would cause millions of Americans to lose their health insurance in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest among us is pretty much the textbook definition of a

mean bill—a mean bill—and even the President thinks so, but just like the Republicans in the Senate, President Trump doesn't want the American people to know what he really thinks of their healthcare plan. That is why he said it was mean behind closed doors at the White House, while in public a few weeks earlier he said it is a "great plan," "very, very incredibly well-crafted." Those are his words, the same bill—the same bill—out to the public: Great bill, great plan; while behind closed doors, what it really is: mean.

All the plaudits the President gave the House bill turned out to be flimsy salesmanship. Speaking candidly to fellow Republicans, the President didn't say: Take up and pass the House bill. He didn't say it was a great plan or that it was very, very incredibly well-crafted. He said it was mean. My Republican friends ought to take this to heart. Even President Trump thinks what Republicans are doing on healthcare is a cruelty to the American people.

As we on this side of the aisle have said before, there is a better way. Republicans shouldn't feel like this mean bill cooked up in secret is their only option. I have invited my Republican friends to meet in the Old Senate Chamber to discuss a bipartisan way forward on healthcare. The Republican leader seems to have foreclosed that option, but the invitation remains and the sentiment remains.

Democrats are willing to work with our Republican friends on improving our healthcare system. We have significant disagreements, sure, but Republicans haven't even tried to sit down with us to hash them out. We would like to try, but if Republicans continue down this path, ignoring the principles of transparency and the open debate that defined this legislative body, we Democrats will continue to do everything we can to shine light on what our Republican friends are doing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in support of Ms. Sigal Mandelker, President Trump's nominee to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Five weeks ago, at Ms. Mandelker's hearing, members of the Banking Committee were moved by her heartfelt story of her parents' escape from the Holocaust. As her father proudly sat behind her, she explained to the committee how, as Holocaust survivors who narrowly avoided death, her parents raised her to never take for granted our safety, security, or freedom.

It was this that motivated Ms. Mandelker to public service, where she had an impressive career in law enforcement and national security at the

Departments of Justice and Homeland Security before joining the private sector.

Like many Americans, she was compelled to action following 9/11 and joined to serve in Justice's counterterrorism and national security mission. Throughout the nomination process, it was obvious Ms. Mandelker would be a strong leader to defend our Nation against terrorism and illicit finance threats. She received bipartisan support from the Banking Committee in a 16-to-7 vote advancing her nomination.

Also, with bipartisan support, just last week the Senate voted on the Iran sanctions bill and our Russia sanctions amendment. Part of Ms. Mandelker's job as Under Secretary would be directly overseeing sanctions policy on Iran, Russia, North Korea, Syria, and some 25 other programs.

In fact, when asked what her top priorities would be in assuming office, she noted that, first and foremost, she will focus on the areas posing the greatest threats—those being North Korea, Iran, ISIS, Syria, and Russia. She also affirmed that she would work closely with the Banking Committee and Congress in carrying out her duties.

I don't need to stress the importance of confirming Ms. Mandelker's nomination so Treasury can carry out this important mission, especially given that the Senate vote on our sanctions package last week was so strong. The two leaders and many Senators of both parties were able to work together to pass this important, comprehensive sanctions legislation, as they should, to ensure Senate confirmation of this nomination.

Given Ms. Mandelker's strong qualifications, dedication to service and mission, and bipartisan support from this committee of jurisdiction, I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brock Long, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Long nomination?

Mr. CRAPO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 148 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blumenthal	Harris	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cantwell	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hirono	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sanders
Carper	Inhofe	Sasse
Casey	Isakson	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Cochran	Kaine	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Stabenow
Corker	Klobuchar	Strange
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	Markey	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—4

Booker
Gillibrand

Schatz
Warren

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Orrin G. Hatch, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso.

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 Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 149 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Baldwin	Franken	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cardin	Inhofe	Schatz
Carper	Isakson	Schumer
Casey	Johnson	Scott
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Cochran	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Strange
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Markey	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Wyden
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Murray	

NAYS—5

Booker
Gillibrand

Harris
Sanders

Warren

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Arkansas.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings and the time during the recess count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas.

EARLY RELEASE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last year, a woman named Carol Denise Richardson was released from Federal prison after President Obama granted her clemency. She had been serving a life sentence for possessing and intending to distribute 50 or more grams of cocaine, on top of having an already lengthy criminal record. She had not done anything specifically violent, so, theoretically, we should have been able to release her early and see good results, at least according to the advocates of criminal leniency.

Unfortunately, nothing good has come from this decision. Now, less than a year later, Carol Richardson is going

back to prison. As part of her release, she was put on a 10-year probation, which meant she had to check in regularly with her probation officers, but she did not. She did not tell them she had left her job. She did not tell them she had moved. She did not even tell them she had been arrested.

Her latest offense, I should say, falls somewhere short of heinous. She was arrested in Pasadena, TX, for stealing \$60 worth of laundry detergent so she could buy drugs.

From everything I have read in the news, it seems clear that Carol Richardson is not a serious, violent menace to society, but it is also clear she was not prepared to reenter society. She still had not kicked her drug habit. She still could not keep and hold a steady job. She still could not meet the most basic requirements of citizenship and basic adulthood.

But the real question is, Why would she be ready? Why would we expect that of her? She never went through the rehab that could have given her a second chance at life. Instead we just threw her in the deep end and watched her sink. That is why I think this story is worth mentioning, because I believe we should give pause to every advocate of criminal leniency.

They like to argue that taking people out of prison both heals communities and saves money. But who was better off once Carol Richardson was released? Not her community; she committed a crime within months. Not the taxpayers; they are still paying for prison costs. And here is the thing: Neither was she. She is back in prison yet again.

But, sometimes, the consequences are worse than this sad story. They are horrifying. Last year, a man named Wendell Callahan brutally killed his ex-girlfriend and her two young daughters. A frantic 911 call from the scene said that the two girls' throats had been slit.

These murders were an atrocity, and they were completely avoidable. Wendell Callahan walked out of Federal prison in August of 2014 after his sentence had been reduced in accordance with the provisions of sentencing guidelines made by the Sentencing Commission. Callahan's original sentence should have kept him in jail until 2018. If he had been in jail instead of on the streets, a young family would be alive today.

What the Richardson case, on one hand, and the Callahan case, on the other hand, show us are two things: First, if we are going to reform the criminal justice system, we shouldn't focus on merely reducing sentences. That doesn't do all that much to help our society. Instead, we should focus on rehabilitating people while they are in prison, whatever the length of their sentence. They need serious help if they can ever hope to redeem themselves and, once they are out of jail, stay out for good. And we should give them that help, not only because it is