

he did. And unless Kim Jong Un is unilaterally dictating the terms of our relations, we should wait until we have the appropriate people and dutiful preparation to achieve the success that we and the world need.

In closing, as we consider this nominee and the nominee for Germany who is also subject to cloture, let me be clear. Despite what the White House wants to claim, Democrats are not obstructing nominees through this body. The facts are simply not on their side. Of 172 positions at the State Department and USAID critical to advancing U.S. interests, the administration has failed to even nominate 77 of those positions, including 45 ambassadorial positions in critical countries, including South Korea, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan, to mention a few. I could go on and on.

Lest we all forget, Republicans control the votes on the Senate floor. Republican leadership can bring up any nominee, once they have passed the committee, at any time. That is their prerogative.

The Founders recognized that an effective democracy needs coequal branches of government to operate in a system of checks and balances. The President has the right to nominate whomever he wants, but the Congress has a responsibility to ensure that person is best suited for the job at hand—we have already seen challenges to some of these nominees in that process—and in the case of our Secretary of State, one who will prioritize diplomacy instead of war and promote fundamental values.

If and when he is confirmed, as someone who has served on both the House and the Senate committees tasked with overseeing foreign policy administration, I am more than willing to work alongside the nominee to provide advice and input as he and the President seek to advance American interests and values on the global stage. I will, of course, in my capacity as ranking member, work alongside him in pursuit of comprehensive and coherent strategies that promote American interests. Despite my misgivings, I will always have an open door and seek opportunities to advance our shared objectives. We stand ready and willing to take any and all actions in the interest of peace, security, and all Americans. That has always been my North Star, and it will always be.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, be allowed to make remarks for about 3 to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I stand here today to urge the very swift confirmation of my good friend, my former colleague, the current Director of the CIA, Mike Pompeo, to serve as America's next Secretary of State.

Mike's résumé would put him at the top of any pile. Speaking as someone who has hired a lot of folks over 28 years in the private sector and now spending time in public service, his résumé shines, but let's talk about his record of results.

I just returned from a trip to China. I was with four other U.S. Senators. We visited China, South Korea. In fact, while in South Korea, we went to the DMZ. I met the Premier of China while I was in Beijing. In fact, the same week that I met the Premier of China, Kim Jong Un met with President Xi in Beijing. We spent time with the Prime Minister of South Korea, as well as time with many other leaders. Their feedback was very clear. Perhaps this is the untold story we are not hearing in the United States, in the media, and it is this: The administration's resolve and their diplomacy is what has brought Kim Jong Un to the negotiating table.

The administration is moving forward toward a denuclearized North Korea, and Mike Pompeo has played a critical role in those efforts. As Secretary of State, Mike would continue to defend and represent American interests abroad, protecting our national security and making the world a safer place.

Mike has not just excelled, he has been the best at everything he has put his mind to over the course of his life. He was first in his class at West Point, a graduate of Harvard Law School, editor of the Harvard Law Review. He served our country in the military. He ran businesses before serving in the U.S. Congress, which is where my path crossed Mike Pompeo's, as we served as colleagues in the U.S. Congress. Mike has the résumé, the character, and the record of results to make him an exceptionally qualified leader for this job.

As we wait here in limbo without a Secretary of State, lives are on the line, our national security is on the line, and our freedom is on the line. I urge my colleagues across the aisle, please stop putting politics before America's national interests. For heaven's sake, this body passed Hillary Clinton through as Secretary of State with 94 votes. I urge them to make the best decision for our country and their constituents back home and join me in confirming Mike Pompeo as our next Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Montana for the unanimous consent request.

CFPB ACTING DIRECTOR MULVANEY

This morning, the New York Times reported that Mick Mulvaney, the head of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—that is the Bureau that saved \$12 billion for 29 million American consumers who have been wronged, cheated, misled, deceived by banks and other financial service actors. Again, that is \$12 billion and 29 million consumers helped by the Consumer Financial Pro-

tection Bureau. Think about that for a second.

This morning, the New York Times reported that Mick Mulvaney, the head of that Bureau—the organization that looks out for or at least used to look out for American bank customers—made a speech to 1,300 bankers yesterday, and he told the banking industry to step up their lobbying efforts.

So you have a government official who took an oath to represent the American public to the best of his ability and to carry out his job to the best of his ability at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and he is going in front of bankers and telling them to step up their lobbying efforts to weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

The Times reported this, and there is a recording of this, so this isn't—as probably Mr. Mulvaney might suggest or the President will suggest—this isn't fake news. There is a real recording. He told banking industry executives on Tuesday that they should press lawmakers hard to pursue their agenda, and he revealed that, as a Congressman, he would meet with lobbyists only if they had contributed to his campaign.

Here is what the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau said. He was a Member of Congress—a far-right, tea party, Republican Member of Congress who took a lot of bank contributions, I would add, but I will put that aside for a minute—until he became the head of the Office of Management and Budget and then of the Bureau. He said: “We had a hierarchy in my office in Congress.” That is when he served down the hall here at the other end of the Capitol in the U.S. Congress. “We had a hierarchy in my office in Congress,” he told 1,300 bankers and lending industry officials at the American bankers conference in Washington. He said:

We had a hierarchy in my office in Congress. If you're a lobbyist who never gave us money, I didn't talk to you. If you're a lobbyist who gave us money, I might talk to you.

I guess you can't call that bribery. I am not suggesting exactly that it is bribery. But you are saying: If you didn't give me money, I wouldn't talk to you, and if you gave me money, maybe I would talk to you.

Again, I am not a lawyer, and I don't think that is under the classification of bribery, but I think it is pretty awful. It is pretty awful when the guy who appointed you said he was going to clear the swamp. It is pretty awful when you have been elected by the people—in his case, of South Carolina—and you say: If you didn't give me money, I wouldn't talk to you, and if you gave me money, maybe I would talk to you. Can you believe that? This is a high-ranked, U.S. Government official who was confirmed by the U.S. Senate—at least for the first job at the Office of Management and Budget. Deciding who you will meet with based on campaign contributions is the kind of pay-to-play

that makes Americans furious with Washington, DC.

President Trump got elected because he was going to drain the swamp. President Trump got elected because he said the system was rigged. President Trump got elected because he doesn't want this pay-to-play. President Trump got elected because this place needs to be cleaned out. Then he appoints somebody to be the head of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau who only really wants to talk to you if you gave him campaign money, which is fundamentally what he said.

If the policy at his congressional office has been his policy at OMB and his policy at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, it has corrupted all of his work. It is hard to believe otherwise. Mr. Mulvaney should resign. He should resign.

Mr. Mulvaney should release his schedule since he has been head of the Bureau. One of the functions of the U.S. Senate, of either party, regardless of the President, is to oversee what exactly is happening in the executive branch of government, and I think it is important that we see Mr. Mulvaney's schedule. Who is he meeting with? What kind of contributions did they make to him when he was a Congressman? Is he directing money to the Senate majority or to the House majority Members to help Speaker RYAN? Is he sending money to political candidates who have been his allies in trying to emasculate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau?

Mr. Mulvaney should resign. He should release his schedule. The White House should quickly nominate a permanent CFPB Director with bipartisan support and, may I suggest, a moral compass. I will say that again. The White House should quickly nominate a permanent Director of the Bureau with bipartisan support and a moral compass. Banks and payday lenders already have armies of lobbyists on their side; they don't need one more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Texas.

#### CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this afternoon, the House Judiciary Committee will begin to consider their version of a bill I have introduced here in the Senate with the junior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, called the CORRECTIONS Act. This legislation addresses prison reform—an issue at the forefront of how justice is administered in this country—by focusing on reducing rates of recidivism, or repeat offenders, and ensuring that those reentering society can become productive members of our communities without threatening the crime rate.

Our efforts here are important, as re-offense rates in our country remain at high levels. In other words, our criminal justice system has become a revolving door, with reoffense rates of more than 75 percent for State pris-

oners and nearly 50 percent for Federal prisoners. So there is a 75-percent chance that somebody who goes to State prison will end up going back and a 50-percent chance that a Federal prisoner will end up going back unless we do something about it.

In law school, students are taught that the bedrock principles of our criminal justice system are deterrence, retribution, incapacitation, and rehabilitation. The reality is that somewhere along the way, we forgot about rehabilitation, and our prisons have literally become a warehouse for people who have been convicted of criminal offenses. That reality is part of the reason that my State of Texas and several other States have led the way not just to be tough on crime but to be smart on crime too.

Texas focused on the important role rehabilitation can play by implementing statewide prison reforms to help offenders learn to overcome the reasons they went to prison in the first place—whether it is a drug or alcohol habit or an addiction, whether it is simply being unprepared to enter the workforce because they dropped out of school or, perhaps, they have some sort of learning disability.

By using recidivism reduction programs like job training or alcohol and drug rehabilitation and letting prisoners go to school while they are in prison to earn a GED or to learn a marketable skill, Texas has reduced its incarceration rate and crime rate by double digits at the same time. Let me say that again. We have reduced our incarceration rate and our crime rate by double digits at the same time.

The end all and be all, in my view, of our criminal justice system must be to reduce the crime rate. In other words, whatever else we do, if the crime rate doesn't go down, we are not getting it right. As a result of the State-based reforms that I am talking about, we have actually been able to reduce incarceration rates and crime rates too.

I must say that when we talk about rehabilitation of prisoners, we are not talking about something we do to them. They have to want it. They have to want to turn their lives around, and they have to take advantage of the opportunities we provide them to do so, because that sort of personal transformation requires extraordinary commitment. Again, it is not something the government can do to somebody. They need to do it for themselves with the help we provide.

By doing so, we found that we can save billions of dollars for taxpayers, and we spared countless victims from further criminal activity. You have to wonder, from the time somebody comes out of prison to the time they reoffend and go back, how many crimes have they committed? How many people's lives have changed forever?

Finally, when they get apprehended for committing a crime, we tend to look at that in isolation, but the truth is, for people who live lives of crimi-

nality, this is what they do full time. They commit numerous crimes against property and against people. If we can reduce the crime rate, we can help them get back on their feet and become productive members of society, and we can save money at the same time. It strikes me that this is a pretty good deal.

For years I have tried to bring the successful State-based experiments and models to Washington, DC. That is why I felt it was important to reintroduce the bipartisan CORRECTIONS Act with the junior Senator from Rhode Island. Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, my cosponsor of this legislation, and I have very different perspectives on the world. He is a Democrat. I am a Republican. I am a conservative, and I would say he is at least a liberal. I don't know if maybe he would call himself a progressive. The fact is that we tried this and it works. Rather than having the Federal Government and the entire country be a laboratory for experimentation when it comes to things like this, isn't it better to let the States do what they always were conceived of being capable of doing, which is to be the laboratories of democracy? See what works and then take those successful experiments and scale them up so the whole Nation can benefit—that is what this legislation does.

This bill requires the Department of Justice to develop assessment tools that will assess the recidivism risk on all eligible offenders. In other words, we are not going to give hardcore multiple offenders—violent criminals—the benefit of these programs. What we will do is to start with the low-risk and moderate-risk offenders. We have scientific tools, tests, and the like that can help us make better decisions on who ought to be eligible and who should not.

We also shift the Federal Bureau of Prisons resources toward those most likely to commit future crimes. In other words, if we take low-level and mid-level offenders and we give them a way out to turn their lives around and become productive and we reduce the crime rate, that gives us more opportunity to focus on the hardcore violent criminals that are the greatest threat to our communities across the board. Focusing on less restrictive conditions for lower risk inmates and focusing on the hardcore violent criminals gives us a chance to concentrate our efforts on the people most likely to commit future crimes and to reoffend.

Our bill requires the Bureau of Prisons to partner with private organizations, including ones that are not-for-profit or faith-based, to promote recidivism reduction. We have had some very successful programs in Texas where religious organizations will go into the prisons and offer people a chance, not only to learn the skills they need in order to succeed on the outside but to turn their lives around by recognizing a higher power in their life. This is the