

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

Coons	Hoeven	Portman
Corker	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cornyn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cotton	Isakson	Rounds
Crapo	Johnson	Rubio
Cruz	Jones	Sasse
Daines	Kaine	Schatz
Donnelly	Kennedy	Schumer
Durbin	King	Scott
Enzi	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Ernst	Lankford	Shelby
Feinstein	Leahy	Sullivan
Fischer	Lee	Tester
Flake	Manchin	Thune
Gardner	McCaskill	Tillis
Graham	McConnell	Toomey
Grassley	Moran	Udall
Hassan	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Hatch	Murphy	Warner
Heinrich	Nelson	Wicker
Heitkamp	Paul	Young
Heller	Perdue	

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Markey	Smith
Cantwell	Menendez	Stabenow
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth	McCain
-----------	--------

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nalbandian nomination?

Mr. COTTON. 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 assistant 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. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 95 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Corker	Ernst
Barrasso	Cornyn	Fischer
Blunt	Cotton	Flake
Boozman	Crapo	Gardner
Burr	Cruz	Graham
Capito	Daines	Grassley
Cassidy	Donnelly	Hatch
Collins	Enzi	Heitkamp

Heller	McConnell	Sasse
Hoeven	Moran	Scott
Hyde-Smith	Murkowski	Shelby
Inhofe	Paul	Sullivan
Isakson	Perdue	Thune
Johnson	Portman	Tillis
Kennedy	Risch	Toomey
Lankford	Roberts	Wicker
Lee	Rounds	Young
Manchin	Rubio	

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth	McCain
-----------	--------

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.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mitchell Zais, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 10 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this afternoon to oppose the nomination of GEN Mitchell Zais, who has been nominated to serve as Secretary DeVos's Deputy Secretary at the Department of Education. I am opposing this nomination because those who work at the top of the Department of Education should be committed to its top priority, which is helping educate our next generation of students. They should not be focused on demonizing teachers or public schools or the Federal Government's role in public education, and they should not be promoting their extreme ideological agendas at the expense of our students.

We need a Department of Education with a positive vision for our neighborhood public schools that believes that

everyone has the right to a high-quality public education no matter where they live or how they learn or how much money their parents make. That is what millions of parents and teachers and students stood up for during Secretary DeVos's confirmation hearing.

Despite the public rejection of her extreme ideology and her unprecedented tie-breaking confirmation vote by Vice President PENCE, it is clear Secretary DeVos has led the Department of Education in the opposite direction. She has continued to push her privatization agenda, trying to siphon taxpayer funds away from our public schools. She has ignored key parts of our Nation's K-12 laws, refusing to hold States accountable for the success of our most vulnerable students. She has made it easier for predatory, for-profit companies to take advantage of students, rolling back protections for students and dismantling the unit that investigates claims of fraud and abuse. Time and again, she has failed to protect students' civil rights. She tried to shrink the Office of Civil Rights. She rolled back protections for transgender students. She rescinded guidance for schools on how to investigate claims of campus sexual assault.

With Secretary DeVos's ideological agenda steering this ship, it is clear to me that the Department of Education needs a strong and independent Deputy Secretary of Education to once again start putting students first. Unfortunately, General Zais made it clear that he would be proud to be Secretary DeVos's right-hand man and shares her position on a number of concerning issues. He agrees with Secretary DeVos's extreme privatization agenda to siphon taxpayer funds from our public schools. He largely opposes the Federal role in education and, like Secretary DeVos, seems to lack even an understanding of key issues important to public schools.

As the State superintendent of education, General Zais allowed his partisan ideology to hurt South Carolina students. He refused Federal funding that could have saved teachers' jobs—the only State to do that—and he objected to plans to expand access to universal pre-K, calling 5-year-olds “too young to learn.” That is a particularly shocking comment to those of us who understand the importance of the first 5 years for children's development.

I come to the floor today on behalf of millions of parents and students and teachers who so loudly objected to Secretary DeVos's agenda during her confirmation, and I ask my colleagues to vote against this nomination and not allow another DeVos-like nominee into the Department of Education.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, 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.