

country. Instead, leaders in that region have been vocal opponents of new pipelines. They blocked the pipelines.

People who have been vocal opponents of the new pipelines include some of the Democrats who represent that part of the country right here in the Senate. They refused to allow responsible and safe energy development to give people in the Northeast the natural gas the families and businesses need. These Democrats claim they are protecting the environment. That is simply not true.

There was a headline in the Boston Globe a couple of weeks ago. The headline was "Our Russian pipeline, and its ugly toll." That was in the Boston Globe. The article pointed out that Russia actually has much lower standards than the United States when it comes to protecting the environment. Democrats are just playing the old game of "not in my backyard." We see the same thing so often when it comes to energy infrastructure projects.

We should be looking for ways to make energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, without raising costs for American families. When it comes to actually producing the energy, Democrats put up roadblocks to keep it from happening.

If we are going to build America's infrastructure, we need to streamline the process, and we need to start cutting the redtape. We need to build faster, better, cheaper, and smarter. It is true for roads and bridges and also true for our energy infrastructure.

Let me conclude by telling you that this article in the Boston Globe called on leaders in the Northeast to stop prioritizing short-term political gains at the expense of energy security and the environment. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to do the same. We should be talking about not just energy security and energy independence and not being dependent on foreign sources of energy from our enemies but focus on American energy, U.S. energy, and American jobs. We certainly shouldn't put America in a position of being dependent on Russia or others to heat our homes and power our economy. We should all support responsible energy infrastructure development so American communities can run on American energy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his remarks on American energy and American energy independence, particularly the work we have done in Wyoming and Colorado. When you think about the opportunities we have to free up markets for Colorado and Wyoming produced oil or gas, it is truly remarkable.

The Senator and I also share the great work that takes place at F.E. Warren Air Force Base. F.E. Warren Air Force Base has a significant role to

play in the nuclear triad, with facilities in both Colorado and Wyoming. That is obviously something very important to our national security.

One of the other things I think is important to bring to this conversation that the Senator from Wyoming talked about is the national security component that energy can play and the important role that it has. We can export our energy not just to the Midwest or to the eastern parts of this country, but we can take that gas produced in Wyoming and Colorado and export it to Asia and Europe, to countries that want American energy, that desire American energy resources, not energy resources from tyrants and dictators like Russia and other places we see around the globe.

This is an opportunity for us to really show, and I commend my colleague for his leadership on energy.

MODERNIZING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to talk primarily about the work Secretary Zinke has done in the Department of Interior and to thank him for taking a bold approach to modernizing the Department of the Interior. I commend him for taking this approach.

The Secretary knows that 93 percent of all Federal land is located in the western part of the United States. This map shows the Federal lands around our country. If you look at the eastern seaboard, you can see a lot of patches of white, with a few patches of red in Virginia, West Virginia, the George Washington National Forest, the Shenandoah National Park. In Florida, you can see the Everglades National Park, the Great Smoky Mountains, but you can see the predominant shade of the western part of this country is red. Red signifies all the areas that are owned by the Federal Government.

Look at the State of Nevada. Almost the entire State of Nevada is owned by the Federal Government—is public land. Look at the State of Colorado. It is public land owned by the Federal Government.

Nationwide, the Bureau of Land Management is responsible for managing approximately 700 million acres of Federal mineral estate located underground and all of the Federal land management agencies' holdings. So it is not just land that is held by the Bureau of Land Management in Colorado, in fact, they hold even more when it comes to our mineral holdings.

The BLM is also responsible for administering 245 million acres of Federal surface lands. As this map points out, nearly all of it in this country is in the 11 western-most States and Alaska.

Historically, local BLM field offices have been diligent and effective managers of the public land for multiple use, as they are charged to do under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

In fact, when I meet with county commissioners and others in the West,

they all talk about the good relationship they have with their field offices and the good decisions they are able to reach with those field offices.

Although, unfortunately, in recent years, directives and management coming from the BLM headquarters in Washington, DC—a long ways away from these publicly held lands out West, the 200-plus million acres of Federal land held by the BLM thousands of miles away from Washington, DC—have favored deep-pocketed, radical special interests over field office decisions and the opinions of those who live near and who actually use this land.

Whether it is the withdrawal of mineral leasing or the reduction of grazing permits, the concept of multiple use—something that was fundamental to the founding of our public land agencies—has fallen out of favor with the Bureau of Land Management.

When you don't live in the communities that are among and surrounded by these lands, it is easy to make these decisions that close off energy development or close off recreational opportunities or close out cattle ranching because the consequences are felt out West, 1,000-plus miles away from the decision makers in the Potomac.

The BLM Headquarters Relocation Act is legislation I have introduced to fix this problem.

I was pleased to see within its budget request that the Department of the Interior is planning a modernization of their organization and infrastructure for the next 100 years. At the very top of this modernization plan should be relocating the BLM headquarters out West. Move it out of Washington and put it exactly in the middle of these lands.

Grand Junction, CO, the Western Slope of Colorado, is a beautiful place, a great city that can accommodate an agency headquarters and has the benefit of a populous that is intimately familiar with public land management policy and decision making. It makes perfect sense. It has a great airport, interstate access, a county with well over half of its land held by public land agencies. It is a community surrounded by public land. It is a community that is surrounded by people who are affected by those public land decisions. Doesn't it make more sense to have those decisions coming from the lands that they are regulating than from the beltway of Washington?

This proposal has strong bipartisan support—Republicans and Democrats who agree. Let's put the decision makers into places where those decisions are felt first and foremost. Making this agency more accountable to the people who have to deal with its management decisions by putting its headquarters among the land managers would be a huge start and a great recognition that we can modernize this agency and this Department for the next 100 years.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this critical piece of legislation, and I look forward to working with Secretary Zinke and the Department of the Interior to achieve this goal.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 3 minutes as in morning business.

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TIP PROPOSAL

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, earlier today I talked to a server who worked in a restaurant in Northeast Ohio, in Trumbull County, north of Youngstown, and she is concerned, as I am, about a proposal from the U.S. Department of Labor that pretty much legalizes wage theft.

We know, in this country right now, servers, or tipped workers, can be the person who pushes the wheelchair in the airport. I spoke to somebody the other day who drove one of those airport carts in the Cleveland airport. She makes \$5 an hour because she is supposed to rely on tips to get up to the minimum wage, but she doesn't always get tips, or a server who works in a restaurant, in a diner in Garfield Heights or in Chillicothe, OH, and makes sometimes only \$2.10 an hour and relies on tips. That is enough of a problem—that companies that employ tipped workers can pay such low wages—but that is compounded by this rule that comes out of the White House and the Department of Labor that really is tantamount to wage theft. The rule simply says the tips you put on the table at a Denny's or at a Bob Evans, the management—the employer—can take those tips and distribute them however he or she wants to other workers in the restaurant.

Now, plenty of waitresses and plenty of waiters and servers give out some of their tips, distribute them to the bartender or others, and that is their choice, but for the employer to be able to take the tips from a worker, from a server, and decide whom to give it to in the back office or in the kitchen—someone they are not paying enough to anyway; to make up for that—or for the employer to just take the money and put it in their pockets, under this rule coming out of the Department of Labor—this is the Secretary of Labor and a government that is supposed to represent workers, supposed to advocate for labor. This administration has turned that upside down, where the Secretary of Labor is advocating for employers and basically legalizing wage theft—taking that money from tipped workers who work so hard.

We know how hard everybody at a diner works. They are not making a lot of money. They rely on those tips. We are going to say—the U.S. Government, the Department of Labor, the President of the United States—is going to say: Oh, it is all right to take some of these tip dollars and put them in my pocket as the employer. Give it to the workers in the kitchen whom the company underpays because they are going to supplement their underpaid wages with tips. It is mean-spirited, it is legitimatizing wage theft, and we have no business doing it. There are 24 of us who have sent a letter to Secretary of Labor Acosta condemning his decision.

First of all, they did a study and found that this would take literally billions of dollars from the pockets of workers. They buried that study. We are saying, at least let that study out. Let people comment. Almost \$6 billion in tips every single year will be lost because of this decision. It is a really bad idea. It is mean-spirited, and it frankly legalizes wage theft. It should be defeated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

Mr. SANDERS. 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—49

| | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|
| Baldwin | Donnelly | Kaine |
| Bennet | Duckworth | King |
| Blumenthal | Durbin | Klobuchar |
| Booker | Feinstein | Leahy |
| Brown | Gillibrand | Manchin |
| Cantwell | Harris | Markey |
| Cardin | Hassan | McCaskill |
| Carper | Heinrich | Menendez |
| Cassey | Heitkamp | Merkley |
| Coons | Hirono | Murphy |
| Cortez Masto | Jones | Murray |

| | | |
|---------|------------|------------|
| Nelson | Shaheen | Warner |
| Peters | Smith | Warren |
| Reed | Stabenow | Whitehouse |
| Sanders | Tester | Wyden |
| Schatz | Udall | |
| Schumer | Van Hollen | |

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Rounds

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 49. The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, John Kennedy, Richard Burr, Mike Lee, David Perdue, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jeff Flake, Lindsey Graham, Patrick J. Toomey, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton, James E. Risch.

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 A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Ex.]

YEAS—69

| | | |
|-----------|--------------|----------|
| Alexander | Coons | Flake |
| Baldwin | Corker | Gardner |
| Barrasso | Cornyn | Graham |
| Bennet | Cortez Masto | Grassley |
| Blunt | Cotton | Hassan |
| Boozman | Crapo | Hatch |
| Burr | Cruz | Heitkamp |
| Capito | Daines | Heller |
| Carper | Donnelly | Hoeven |
| Cassidy | Enzi | Inhofe |
| Cochran | Ernst | Isakson |
| Collins | Fischer | Johnson |