warning signs that emerged prior to the 9/11 attacks, but the President denies it is happening.

I know Director Coats. I served with him when he was a Republican Senator in this body. I know he would not say this if it were not so. Notwithstanding the President's saying that Russia is not targeting us, his own Director of National Intelligence says they are. We can't trust this President's judgment when it comes to Russia.

Remember, the President takes an oath to protect and defend our Nation. When it comes to Russia, it appears he does not intend to abide by his oath to defend and protect our Nation. This Congress is going to be derelict in its duty if it takes no action.

All of us have to speak with a single voice in this moment—Republicans and Democrats alike. We should all condemn the President's actions, which were as dangerous as they were shameful.

These condemnations are important, but words are not enough. Remember, Congress is a coequal branch of government. Remember that the Senate is supposed to be the conscience of the Nation. Let's act like it.

The President, obviously, can't be trusted to keep his hands off of the Russia investigation. By denigrating it at every opportunity and by dismissing its lead investigator last year, he has repeatedly failed the test.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently passed legislation with a strong bipartisan vote. Republicans and Democrats alike voted to protect the special counsel's investigation. That legislation is before the Senate. Let's enact it into law. Let's take what Republicans and Democrats together said in the Judiciary Committee—that we will protect the special counsel's investigation. Let's vote up or down. Let's do it and enact it into law.

It is often said that the only thing President Putin responds to is strength. Let's show him that here in the Congress, we stand united in opposition to his ongoing attempts to attack our democracy. Believe me, they are ongoing right at this moment. Let's pass stronger sanctions targeting him and the oligarchs who enable him, who continue to help him because they become billionaires by doing it. Let's pass a resolution making it clear that if President Trump chooses to stand with President Putin, then he stands alone. The European Union is not our foe. And President Putin is not our friend. Our allies around the world, especially those that have stood with us since World War II, are looking at us at this moment. They are questioning whether the United States will be a reliable partner in the face of creeping authoritarianism, both at home and abroad. Let's show them where we stand.

This is not about politics. It is not about Republicans or Democrats. This is about who we are as a country and what we stand for as Americans—whether we stand for democracy; whether we stand for freedom, including the freedom of the press; whether we stand for the rule of law; whether we stand for truth; and whether we stand for America. As a Vermonter and a Senator, I know where I stand. It is time we stand together.

BLUE-SLIP TRADITION

Madam President, I believe I have colleagues on the floor who are going to make a unanimous consent request, but before they do, I feel obliged to speak up about the steady erosion of the norms and traditions that protect the Senate's unique constitutional role with respect to lifetime appointments to our Federal courts.

We should all be alarmed by the Judiciary Committee's abrupt change in course when it comes to respect for blue slips, which allow home-State Senators to have a word in what happens. This should concern us all. For much of this body's history, blue slips have given meaning to the constitutional requirement of ''advice and consent.'' They have protected the prerogatives of home-State Senators, and they have ensured fairness and comity in the Senate.

When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, under both the Bush and Obama administrations, not a single judicial nominee received a hearing without first receiving both home-State Senators' positive blue slips. Regardless of who was in the Oval Office, I steadfastly defended blue slips because I firmly believed in both their constitutional and institutional importance. I also firmly believed in the prerogatives of home-State Senators and the need to ensure that the White House works in good faith with those Senators.

My decision to defend blue slips was not without some controversy. I faced significant pressure from my own party's leadership to hold hearings for President Obama's nominees who had not received positive blue slips from Republican Senators. I was criticized by liberal advocacy groups and major news outlets like the New York Times, but I resisted such pressure because I believed then—and I still believe now—that certain principles matter more than party.

All of us, whether Democrat or Republican, should care about good-faith consultation when it comes to nominees from our own States. The reasons for this are both principled and pragmatic. We know our States. We know who is qualified to fill lifetime judicial seats that will have a tremendous impact on our neighbors and communities.

This week, the Senate will vote whether to confirm a nominee to the Ninth Circuit, Ryan Bounds, opposed by not one but both of his home-State Senators. Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY were cut out of the nomination process entirely. The White House interviewed Bounds and fast-tracked his nomination without consulting either senator. If Mr. Bounds is confirmed, it will mark the first time in the history of the Senate that a judicial nominee is confirmed despite opposition from both home-State Senators.

My concern is not about a mere piece of paper. My concern is that we are failing to protect the fundamental rights of home-State Senators, and we are failing in our constitutional duty to provide our advice and consent on a President's nominees. That should concern all of us. The Senate should never function as a mere rubberstamp for nominees seeking lifetime appointments to our Federal judiciary.

Without blue slips, nothing prevents a California nominee from being appointed to a Texas court. Nothing prevents our State selection committees from being completely ignored by the White House. That is what we are seeing today. The Oregon bipartisan judicial selection commission overwhelmingly voted that Mr. Bounds—who misled the commission about his controversial writings—did not deserve its recommendation.

Some may dismiss these warnings, but I have served in the Senate long enough to know that winds tend to change direction. Inevitably, the majority becomes the minority. The White House changes hands. I suspect Republicans will rekindle their love of blue slips if they find themselves in the minority under a Democratic President, as they did under President Obama and during my chairmanship. That is precisely why maintaining a single, consistent policy with respect to blue slips is so critical.

That is why I will vote against Mr. Bounds. If we abandon our longstanding traditions to change partisan expediency, that provides only fleeting advantage and inflicts lasting harm in this body. We are better off when we follow the tradition we always have. We foolishly hurt ourselves and our individual States when we allow ourselves to step away from it. I would urge all Senators to ensure that home-State Senators are provided the same courtesies during the Trump administration that they received from both Republican and Democratic Judiciary chairmen during the Obama administration. I ask my fellow Senators to oppose Mr. Bound's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I am about to engage in a brief colloquy about a unanimous consent request with my colleague, the Senator from California.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, I be able to have 5 minutes to do that prior to the vote.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 118

Mr. LEE. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No.

297, S. 118; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I rise today to express concern with S. 118, the Reinforcing American-Made Products Act, because it would preempt California's strong ''Made in America'' labeling standards.

California requires that at least 90 percent of a final product be composed of American-made parts to use the label—the strongest standard in the Nation.

This bill would undo California's tough standard, setting instead a watered-down national standard. Companies could then confuse consumers by flooding the market with products sold under the ''Made in America'' label that were built using more foreign-made components. That is why the California attorney general and the Consumer Federation of California support keeping California's strong standards in place.

The ''Made in America'' label should promote U.S. manufacturing and give consumers confidence that they are supporting American jobs. Consumers want to know that products bearing the ''Made in America'' label are truly made in America. Because this would undermine that confidence and preempt California's strong standards, I believe this bill should not move by unanimous consent. Regretfully, for those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments made by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from California.

When Americans see a ''Made in USA'' label on a product, it is a source of great pride. It represents the American virtues of innovation and industriousness. It is a symbol of support for American manufacturing jobs and high-quality products across the board, and it often spurs American consumers to buy those very products.

The Federal Trade Commission currently enforces a difficult standard for products to claim the ''Made in USA'' label. It requires that all or virtually all of a product must be made in the United States, and it has issued lengthy guidance documents establishing the rules. However, one State holds a different standard—one that is nearly impossible for businesses to meet. Under California's law, if more than 5 percent of the components of a product are manufactured outside the United States, even if that means just a few bolts or a few screws, then that product cannot be labeled ''Made in USA.''

While companies could legally boast this claim in 49 of the 50 States under the Federal standards set by the Federal Trade Commission, they are often unable to do so because of the flow of interstate commerce. Most manufacturers sell wholesale to national and international distributors who then disperse products throughout the country. As a result, companies must label products according to the most rigid definition in order to protect themselves from costly litigation. In short, one State—one single State—is effectively governing how interstate commerce is conducted with regard to ''Made in USA'' labeling throughout the country.

The Reinforcing American-Made Products Act would solve this problem by ensuring that the current Federal definition is the supreme labeling law in interstate commerce without weakening the strong ''Made in USA'' national standard. In addition to upholding the Constitution, which empowers Congress—this body—to regulate interstate commerce, this legislation would provide clarity and consistency, which would help American companies avoid unnecessary hardships and frivolous lawsuits.

In the global marketplace, it is increasingly difficult for small American companies to stay afloat, let alone to compete. This reform would ultimately encourage manufacturing in America and use American tools and resources. It would also help so many of the small businesses and ordinary American workers who are currently being left behind, and helping them ought to be our goal.

This bill passed unanimously out of committee, and it has broad bipartisan support. I am disappointed that it is being blocked by the few people who do not support it when it could benefit all 50 of our States. We should exercise this authority, and we should open the flow of interstate commerce.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

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

Mr. LEE. 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).

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

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.

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 Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

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 Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).