

are too high, and yet the program he announced last Thursday was a humiliation for the President. From one end of the Nation to the other, they said this does nothing. In fact, the stock prices of the pharmaceutical industry went up as he gave his speech—no better proof that he wasn't doing anything.

President Trump promised that his tax bill would be a middle-class miracle; instead, it is a giveaway mostly to corporations and the wealthy, with 80 percent going to the wealthiest people and most powerful corporations in America. Already we are seeing higher healthcare premiums and rising gas prices eat away at any meager tax benefit middle-class families received.

So, to ask the question that has been asked time and time again of middle-class people, "Are you better off today than the day President Trump became President," most people are not because so many costs are going up and so many promises that President Trump made are not being fulfilled. The President seems to think rhetoric is in one place and action is in another and the twain never meet. So he talks a good game and acts on behalf of the powerful and special interests that hurt the middle class.

Here is another one. What about infrastructure? President Trump promised the Nation a \$1 trillion infrastructure bill to build gleaming new roads, bridges, and tunnels. It took him over 1 year to propose a detailed infrastructure plan, and when he did, it wasn't even close to \$1 trillion and has gone nowhere. One of his spokespersons said: We are not doing infrastructure this year. That was one of his biggest promises to the American people—gone.

How about trade? Trade is an issue where the President and I mostly agree. As I have said, I believe I am much closer to President Trump on trade than either Presidents Obama or Bush. I publicly and privately told him as much, but now I am beginning to doubt him even on trade.

He talks a big game on China, he promises to be tough, and yet this weekend, on the toughest thing he did—the thing that woke up the Chinese and made them think we were serious—the President backed off. Not only may President Trump allow China to evade the consequences of rapaciously stealing American intellectual property, he also pledged to help a Chinese telecom company guilty of violating U.S. sanctions. Even on trade, where the President and I mostly agree on policy, President Trump hasn't delivered, to the chagrin of me and millions of Americans who depend on fairer trade policies for jobs and income.

Finally, what about draining the swamp? This is his big cry. That is all we hear on FOX News: The President wants to drain the swamp. It was a central campaign pledge, but what happened when the President got to Washington? He filled his Federal Government with industry lobbyists and rich

executives with sprawling conflicts of interests. His Cabinet Secretaries have engaged in flagrant graft, enjoying luxuries on the taxpayers' dime.

His administration hardly even vets its candidates. No President, at least in my career, has done as much to fill up the swamp as President Trump. If the American people look at his actions, not his rhetoric, the swamp has gotten much worse, and a lot of it is because of what President Trump did.

Mr. President, you can't say you are draining the swamp and then have an administration abounding with conflicts of interests and abounding with people who favor the wealthy and hurt the middle class.

Of course, there has been no "bill of love" for Dreamers.

The President said he was going to stand up to the NRA. He told a couple of Senators that you shouldn't be afraid of them.

And we haven't seen a check from Mexico on the border wall.

It is a plain fact that this President talks the talk but fails time and time and time again to walk the walk. The Trump administration has left behind a trail of broken promises. There is example after example of this President's failing to deliver. He has dropped the ball for the middle class on healthcare, on trade, on prescription drugs, on draining the swamp, and on infrastructure. On each issue he said he would do something. He hasn't.

I actually agree with a good number of President Trump's campaign promises. I want us to be tough on China. I want to bring more accountability and transparency to government. We Democrats want a trillion-dollar infrastructure bill, and we want to bring down the alarming costs of prescription drugs, but this President either lacks the commitment, the consistency, or the know-how to make real progress on any of these issues.

That is not good enough—not for the millions of Americans who voted for him because they expected him to deliver or the millions who didn't vote for him but need him to deliver because he is President of the United States and the buck stops with him.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, notwithstanding what we sometimes hear about a deadlocked Washington, there are times when both parties work together. Three months ago, Republicans and Democrats came together, and we reached a bipartisan budget agreement. Republicans and Democrats together

reached an agreement to lift the budget caps and provide relief from sequestration but, most importantly, to make responsible and new investments in the American people over the next 2 years. Then, President Trump, as he stated earlier that he would do if we reached that agreement, signed it into law.

But now, even though he signed it into law and even though the agreement had been worked out with Republicans, Democrats, and the White House together, the President has proposed—and, unfortunately, House Republicans have drawn up a proposal—to claw back vital funding for children's healthcare, to claw back funding for rural communities, to take back funding for our infrastructure programs, and to take back funding for law enforcement.

These programs from which the White House and, apparently, their allies in the House want to raid the money aren't Democratic priorities. They are bipartisan, American priorities. Ivanka Trump has said that American families need relief. The policies that allow women with children to thrive shouldn't be just for a press conference or a photo opportunity. They should be the norm.

President Trump's proposal would claw back \$7 billion from the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP. If you can't keep a child healthy, what are they going to be like as an adult? CHIP currently provides health insurance for 8.7 million vulnerable children from low-income families. Millions of families from red States and blue States, urban and rural, depend on CHIP to keep their children healthy and happy and to make them the healthy and happy future generation. I don't know how pulling \$7 billion out of this program aligns with the policies to allow children to thrive and to say that should be the norm. You can't say at a press opportunity: This will be the norm—to allow children to thrive—but oh, by the way, we are going to take back the money to make that work. And if the money can no longer be dedicated to the CHIP program, well, then reinvest it in other important programs as we have done in the past—programs that support our Nation's children and families, including Head Start, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program, opioid prevention, and cutting-edge research at NIH.

The President's proposal also takes away \$159 million from our law enforcement. I began my career in law enforcement. I can't understand taking \$159 million from law enforcement. The President claims that he is going to "support our police like our police have never been supported before." This week is National Police Week. Today, May 15, is designated as National Peace Officers Memorial Day. This is when we pause to thank and recognize our Nation's law enforcement officers for their important work and those officers who sacrificed their

lives. How does cutting \$159 million in resources support our law enforcement?

Then the President's proposal will claw back \$462 million from infrastructure programs. The President has tweeted often that our infrastructure will, again, be the best in the world—the greatest in the world, he tweets. A tweet doesn't cost anything, but if you are going to match your actions and your words, it may cost something. It doesn't help if you are going to take almost half a billion dollars out of our infrastructure at the same time that you are saying and tweeting that we are going to make it the best in the world.

He said he is going to cut \$252 million that is meant to combat infectious diseases that threaten the United States and threaten millions of Americans who travel, work, serve, and study abroad. Just last week, there were confirmed cases of the Ebola virus in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This is not a fight we should be retreating from.

We shouldn't say we will stop money to fight infectious diseases but then we send our soldiers abroad. We send our Peace Corps abroad. We send our diplomats abroad, and Americans travel abroad. We have students who go abroad. Don't retreat from that fight.

The United States will not be ready to face the flu pandemic until it improves its vaccines, its healthcare infrastructure, and its coordination with other countries—all of which we are told are top priorities for the White House, according to a National Security Council official who said on Monday:

Influenza is a priority to the White House, and represents both a health security and a national security threat. Today, however, we cannot respond with the speed that we need to.

This is probably because of the large number of deaths of Americans inside the United States during the last flu season. But what do they do? They cut back a quarter of a billion dollars meant to combat infectious diseases. The photo op where they say that we are against these kinds of infections in the United States looks good. Nobody is going to disagree with being against it. I hope my colleagues will disagree with cutting out the money we need to carry out the President's promise.

Then, there is the proposal to claw back \$1 billion meant to invest in our rural communities. Almost 2 months ago, in about March—it seems so long ago—Secretary Perdue testified before the Senate that "prosperity in rural America is particularly vital, not just for the rural communities we love, that many of us call home, but also for our entire Nation." I agree with Secretary Perdue. Many of us do call rural communities home. My own town has 1,800 people in it. I love it, so I agree with him, but whether it is a rural community in my State or any of the 50 States, we don't invest in their pros-

perity, as the administration has promised, if we strip \$1 billion in resources from them.

In fact, the President's promises this will not be his last proposal. He is going to send another package in the coming weeks that would attack the foundation of the bipartisan agreement—an agreement Republicans and Democrats reached in Congress and was signed into law by the President. He is going to go back on that, adding even more rescissions.

I am sure he is looking at the deficit. The President's tax giveaway to billionaires and corporations increased our Nation's deficit by \$1.9 trillion. According to the CBO, the rescission bill the House will debate next week will save only \$1 billion—a tiny, tiny fraction of what has been given away to billionaires and corporations.

The President's actions should match his words. He says "America First," but then just in the last few days, he has gone out of his way to fight to save jobs, but they are Chinese jobs. I would rather he fight to save jobs in our State. I wish that rather than spending his time fighting to save Chinese jobs, the President would work to save American jobs. We have people who could use jobs in our country. Let China worry about China's jobs. Don't have the President spending his time, first, cutting the money to create jobs in America and then spending time fighting to save Chinese jobs in China. You can't strip investments from the American people and say you are in favor of saving jobs in China and say that somehow this is making America strong.

In the Senate, though, there is good news. We are focused on moving forward, on a bipartisan basis, on the fiscal year 2019 process. Just yesterday, Chairman SHELBY and I announced a schedule. We will mark up all 12 of the appropriations bills by the end of June. Our staffs, Republican and Democratic alike, are going to be working nights and weekends to get us in this position. We, as Senators, are committed to spending whatever amount of time it takes—whether we have to go into the evening, whether we have to go throughout the week—to get all 12 of them marked up by the end of June.

I hope the House Republican leader will abandon this ill-considered rescission bill. This is not the start to the fiscal year 2019 process I would have hoped for.

Chairman SHELBY and I have different patterns and different philosophies, but we want the Senate to work. We are working very hard together. I have great respect for him in putting together our 12 appropriations bills. We can do it. We will be a better body if we do it. Let's stop the tweeting and the sloganeering, and let's deal with substance.

WELL WISHES FOR FIRST LADY MELANIA TRUMP AND HARRY REID

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I would say, on another matter, a

personal matter, that my wife Marcelle and I wish the best and a speedy recovery to the First Lady. That is one thing I hope every single Member of this Senate, Republican and Democratic, agree with. I hope she has a speedy and complete recovery. My wife knows, from personal experience, what she is going through. Recovery can come, but you have to work at it.

I would also note, in our family, our thoughts and prayers are for the recovery of the former Democratic leader, Harry Reid. Our prayers are for him and his family. I am glad to hear he is recovering from his surgery, and we wish him the very best.

I yield the floor.

I see nobody else seeking recognition, so 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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 607 as under the previous order.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, 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.

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

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Ex.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Blunt	Cardin
Barrasso	Boozman	Carper
Bennet	Burr	Cassidy
Blumenthal	Capito	Collins