

our democracy posed by President Putin and Putin's Russia.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, before I talk about the resolution Senators MENENDEZ, SCHATZ, and I have authored that will be voted on at 1:45 p.m., I would like to say a few words about the work the Senators from Delaware and Arizona did and my severe disappointment that there was objection from the Republican leadership.

The bottom line is very simple. President Trump has put our country in a foreign policy crisis. President Trump has weakened the security of this country. A resolution is the minimum we can do. We should be acting.

The idea that we cannot even pass a resolution in this body because of the objection on the other side, when this was done in a bipartisan, careful way by the Senators from Arizona and Delaware, shows something very bad. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so cowered by a President that they cannot stand up for national security. They cannot stand up to Vladimir Putin, just as the President seems not to be able to.

I have one more point. From what I am told, one of the major objections from the other side was that Congress wished the contemporaneous notes from that secret 2-hour meeting be made available. That is key.

What are they hiding? What are they afraid of? The American people have a right to know what went on in that meeting, particularly when President Putin gets up and talks about some agreements that it seems not even our high-ranking officials in the State and Defense Departments and intelligence agencies know about. This is amazing.

We have come to a really low moment in this body when a bipartisan resolution that is rather modest and limited—I had talked to the Senator from Delaware. He knows I wanted much more in this resolution, but in an effort to get something done, we limited it.

In my view—the view of most Americans—the notes should be made available. The translator should be made available. The translator wasn't specifically referred to in this resolution, but when they talked about relevant people coming, my view—and I believe the view of the Senator from Delaware—was that would include the translator. I am not sure if it was the view of the Senator from Arizona. It doesn't matter. We are not even passing this resolution.

I have to say, this was a moment for bipartisanship. This was a moment for America pulling together. This was a moment, when the President doesn't served the country well, that Americans of all parties, all ideologies come together and fill that void and undo the misdeeds that occurred in Helsinki.

Unfortunately, because of weakness, fear—my guess is, if you looked inside

the hearts and minds of every Member on the other side, all but maybe one or two would feel this is the right resolution, but they are afraid. Fear will not get us anywhere. Letting a bully push us around, meaning President Putin, as he pushed President Trump around, will not serve this country well. It is a sad moment that this resolution was rejected.

S. RES. 584

Madam President, before I yield to my good friend, the hard-working and very able ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I want to talk about our resolution which we are going to vote on. Lord knows what would happen if we couldn't have even gotten a vote on that.

The idea that an American ambassador, who served us so well, should be brought before Putin and his minions to be questioned, when there is no charge against him, no issue against him—it is not like the 12 Russians who are indicted for trying to interfere with our elections. It is not even an analogy. There is not an evenness. President Trump amazingly called this an "incredible offer." Our President is saying that one of our Ambassadors being hauled before an authoritarian regime that twists the truth, that lies at will, that even seems to kill people they want to with poison in other countries is an incredible offer?

Well, this resolution is a fine resolution. It will pass. It doesn't undo what just happened. It doesn't make up for the fact that our colleagues are afraid to take real action, even a resolution that posits action in terms of the major misdeeds at Helsinki. At the very least, we are protecting the integrity of the men and women who serve us, because if today it is the Ambassador, tomorrow it could be somebody in the military or somebody in the intelligence agencies or elsewhere.

This resolution is very clear. What it says is, when President Trump called Putin's offer an "incredible offer," he was incredibly wrong. No President can put one of our fine servants at risk who has worked hard, in this case, for the diplomatic corps. This resolution is a bare minimum of what we should be doing here. I am glad it will be on the floor, and I suspect it will pass—hopefully, unanimously.

I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I am very pleased to join with the distinguished Democratic leader in co-authoring this resolution.

S. RES. 583

Madam President, before I speak to it, I do want to speak to the Flake-Coons resolution.

Certainly, I would have supported it; although, I believe it is the minimum of what this body should be expressing after what we saw in Helsinki. This is a moment for bipartisanship and for patriotism because what I saw in Hel-

sinki speaks to the opposite of standing up to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

In the majority whip's objection to the resolution coming to a vote, I find it interesting that, among other things, he was talking about our having more sanctions against Russia, which I will speak to shortly. We are in the midst of developing a new, strong package of sanctions as it relates to Russia. So I embrace and welcome him to that effort if he seeks to actually see real sanctions against Russia.

We have sanctions. There are sanctions that passed by 98 to 2 in this institution and that passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives, which forced the President to sign it as a result of there having been overwhelming votes. These were sanctions that were largely mandatory but have not been fulfilled. So we could start off by having a robust engagement of the existing sanctions.

I am not quite sure how we start being tough on Russia. One of the elements of those sanctions was to go after Russia's sales of defense weapons. Yet here we are, and we are already looking for waivers. There is a difference between a country that, maybe, has a long history of buying Russian military equipment, but the S-400—a new anti-defense system—is a new version. That is not a legacy issue. I am not sure how we are going to tell one country it can buy the S-400 but tell another country it can't. It doesn't work. That is how sanctions begin to crumble at the end of the day. Yet I welcome the response that we should be having new sanctions.

S. RES. 584

Madam President, as it relates to this resolution, it is outrageous that the White House would not instantaneously and firmly dismiss a proposition that Russian prosecutors question a former U.S. Ambassador. Again and again, we have seen President Trump take Vladimir Putin's word. It is unconscionable that this White House would give anything other than a full-throated defense of America's Foreign Service, like Ambassador Mike McFaul, who has served our country with honor and distinction.

The reason Putin doesn't like Mike McFaul is that as our U.S. Ambassador, he stood up for democracy and human rights in Russia; he stood up to the Russian regime; and he promoted American values and ideals. He spoke truth to power inside Russia. That is why Putin wants him. Congress shouldn't have to tell America's President to stand up for America's public servants and its diplomatic corps, but apparently we have to.

President Trump has repeatedly dismissed Russia's attack in 2016 and shrugs off the threat it poses today, despite all of our intelligence agencies and the Director of National Intelligence, just days ago, saying there are red blinking lights about Russia's continual engagement and interference in

the elections that will take place 110 days from now.

This week, he has continuously and directly contradicted his own national security advisers and, instead, has embraced the line of Putin and Russian intelligence. Now, I know they have been trying to clean it up. Yet he has said it so many times and in the same way he said it in Helsinki. That is what he really believes. Now for him to say something that is different—wrong time, wrong continent, not too much. He has spouted talking points that have sounded like they have come straight from the Kremlin. He has shown a willingness to accede to Putin's requests to interrogate Americans, a willingness to accept Putin's denials about Russian interference, a willingness to attack NATO allies like Montenegro, and a willingness to be a supplicant to Putin's views.

The President keeps claiming he has been tough on Russia. No. It is Congress that has been tough on Russia by its passing CAATSA, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, with broad and deep bipartisan support. Yet the White House hasn't taken it seriously. It has ignored a series of mandates in the law. The clear tone and intent that came from the Helsinki summit was one of accommodation, not of pressure.

I don't see any other way forward, other than through further congressional action, to forcefully call out and address the administration's willful paralysis to Putin's abhorrent behavior. To date, our efforts have been transformative, but just as the administration has been prepared to find ways that allow Putin to circumvent the law and to avoid implementing mandatory provisions of CAATSA, we must be equally prepared to adjust and adapt by closing those loopholes.

That is why I will soon introduce comprehensive legislation to increase pressure to actually implement the law and increase pressure on Russia for its aggression against the United States and our allies. Among the considerations we have for this new legislation are to increase sanctions on Russia's energy sector, to increase sanctions on its cyber sector, to increase pressure on Russia's oligarchs and those who are closest to Putin, and to look at Russia's sovereign debt as a target.

We cannot wait to see whether Russia will attack us in the 2018 election. We know it is in the midst of making that a reality, and we need to ramp up the pressure. We can't afford to wait.

Based on this President's behavior, we also need to protect our institutions here at home. That is why we want to include protections for the Office of Special Counsel. The President has done more to target Bob Mueller than he has to go after Vladimir Putin, and this must stop. This effort must be bipartisan, which is why I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues who truly want to see us fight back on Russia and nearly all of whom

voted to increase sanctions on Russia last year and place more authority for sanctions alleviation in the hands of Congress. They were right to support such measures in July of 2017, and God knows it would now be right to step up and defend America's interests.

It is time to show the American people that we can be patriots, not just partisans. It is time to show the world that we can put our country over party. It is time that we defend America's democratic institutions against Russia's continued aggression. I look forward to the resolution and its vote, and I urge everyone to join us in approving it.

I yield the floor.

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.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we will vote today on the confirmation of Ryan Bounds to the Ninth Circuit. He has been nominated to fill the vacancy left by Judge O'Scannlain. Mr. Bounds once served as a law clerk to Ninth Circuit Judge O'Scannlain.

Mr. Bounds is highly qualified to serve on the Ninth Circuit. A native of Oregon, he attended Stanford University and Yale Law School. He has dedicated his career to public service and has served in government for the past 14 years. The last 8 years were as an assistant U.S. attorney in Oregon.

I have listened to my colleagues on the other side voice their opposition to Mr. Bounds. Interestingly, none of them cite anything Mr. Bounds has done in his legal career as a reason for opposing his nomination. Instead, they focus on two things. First, they say we shouldn't confirm Mr. Bounds because his home State Senators didn't return their blue slips. Second, they say some of Mr. Bounds' college writings were insensitive. So I am going to start with point No. 1 on which they base their opposition to him.

As I have explained so many times on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in the Senate Judiciary Committee—and I don't know how many times to the multitudes of journalists who are on the Hill—my blue-slip policy is the same as all but 2 of my 18 predecessors who were chairmen of the Judiciary Committee over the 100-year history of blue slips. Like Chairmen Ted Kennedy, Joe Biden, and ORRIN HATCH, I will hold hearings for circuit court nominees who have negative or unreported blue slips if the White House has consulted with the home State Senators, and I will not allow Senators to abuse the blue-slip courtesy for political or ideological reasons.

In the case of Mr. Bounds, the White House sought the Oregon Senators' input, seriously considered the one

candidate suggested by the Oregon Senators, and waited several months for the Senators from Oregon to establish their judicial selection committee, which is quite a tradition in that State. The selection committee itself even recommended Mr. Bounds. Yet the Oregon Senators still didn't return their blue slips.

They say it was because Mr. Bounds didn't disclose some of his college writings to the selection committee. There is a very good reason he didn't—the selection committee never asked for his college writings. In fact, Senator WYDEN's staff instructed Mr. Bounds not to disclose them. Moreover, the Oregon Senators refused to ever meet with Mr. Bounds during this whole process.

It has been misleadingly said this will be the first time in modern history we will have confirmed a judge without there having been at least one positive blue slip from the two State Senators. My Democratic colleagues have only themselves to blame. The way the blue slip used to be enforced was through the 60-vote filibuster, and that was done away with in November 2013, led by the then-Democratic majority and Senator Reid.

For example, Chairman HATCH held hearings for five nominees in 2003 and 2004, despite there being the lack of a positive blue slip from either home State Senator. These nominees were voted out of committee. Then Senate Democrats blocked these nominees on the floor by using the 60-vote filibuster. But my Democratic colleagues abolished that filibuster, as I said, in 2013 for the reason that they needed the votes and the freedom to pack the DC Circuit with liberal judges who would uphold Obama's regulatory schemes.

Leading this effort was none other than Senator MERKLEY of Oregon, who argued that 41 Senators shouldn't be able to block a Senate majority from confirming judges. Now they have a different point of view. Now he argues that he alone should have the right to block Mr. Bounds from even getting a hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

In November of 2013, I told my Democratic colleagues that they would regret abolishing the filibuster just to stack the DC Circuit Court of Appeals with their friends. Now, obviously, today, as they consider the Bounds nomination, they know they made a mistake.

Turning to the only other criticism my colleagues have made about Mr. Bounds, which is in regard to his college writings, I don't believe that misguided statements made in a college newspaper 25 years ago should disqualify Mr. Bounds. I hope we don't live in a world where controversial things that we write in college end our careers forever. This is especially true with our kids and grandkids now in the era of social media.

For example, a few years ago, just when the same thing came up on Justice Wright going to the Minnesota

District Court, I voted and supported her despite very controversial writings she had in law school. We shouldn't assume that views expressed years ago during college and law school represent the nominee today.

Mr. Bounds testified that he regretted much of what he wrote in those op-eds.

We received numerous letters in support of Mr. Bounds' nomination from people who have known him personally throughout his life. We received a letter from some of his classmates at Stanford. And before I quote, it is kind of like—these sound like they were his friends in the dormitories. I never was a dormitory student, but I imagine you really get acquainted with people there. This is what they had to say about Mr. Bounds:

We have become aware of a handful of controversial op-eds and articles Ryan wrote for *The Stanford Review* during that time. None of us believes that these writings reflect Ryan's character, either then or now. All of us remember our dorm-mate fondly.

We are a diverse bunch. Yet Ryan never failed to treat all of us with courtesy, respect, and civility, regardless of our respective genders, sexual orientations, skin colors, religions, ethnicity, or any other characteristics.

There is not, and never has been, a racist, sexist, homophobic, or bigoted bone in Ryan Bounds's body.

Mr. Bounds has also been a community leader, promoting diversity and equality. As a member of the Multnomah Bar Association's Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee, Mr. Bounds spearheaded programs to expose underprivileged young people to the legal profession. He mentored young scholarship recipients and helped those same people navigate law school admissions and law school. He expanded low-cost CLE offerings and organized anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training.

Mr. Bounds is imminently qualified to serve on the Ninth Circuit. His college writings do not represent who he is today. His professional accomplishments and exemplary public service speak much more loudly to his character and integrity.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Mr. Bounds' confirmation today.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Madam President, I would like to say one thing about another nomination issue. I understand that so far, no Senate Democrat has met with Judge Kavanaugh. They are apparently awaiting their marching orders from the minority leader. Well, the American people elected each one of those Democratic Senators to represent them, not the minority leader. And when Senate Democrats have largely already made up their minds to vote against Judge Kavanaugh and none of them have even met with him, their demand for a paper chase beyond relevant material sounds more and more like a demand for a taxpayer-funded fishing expedition.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR BOB RAY

Now, Madam President, I would like to address my colleagues in the U.S. Senate on the life and death of Governor Bob Ray, a wonderful Governor for the State of Iowa over a long period of time. I wish to honor him in this way.

I wish to pay tribute to my good friend and an exceptional Iowan whose life and legacy will be remembered in my home State for generations to come. As the people of Iowa mourn the loss of our 38th Governor, I would like to share about a few ways that Robert D. Ray made Iowa a better place to grow. Looking back at his lifetime of service, it seems nearly impossible that one person could wear so many hats and reach the highest rungs of distinguished service in both his private life and in the public sector.

After graduating from high school in 1946, Bob enlisted in the U.S. Army to serve his country that way. He returned from service and earned undergraduate and law degrees at Drake University in Des Moines, IA. He married the love of his life, Billie, and together they raised three daughters.

In addition to serving 14 years as our State's chief executive from 1969 to 1983, Governor Ray also served as our State party chairman at the age of 35, chairman of the National Governors Association, interim mayor of Des Moines, 11th president of Drake University, U.S. delegate to the United Nations Conference on Refugees, and CEO and board member to a number of non-profit and for-profit corporations.

Reading such an outstanding resume, one might come to the conclusion that this Iowan must have an outsized ego to match. To that, I can personally affirm that Bob Ray was a humble leader driven by a servant's heart. He brought honesty, dignity, and integrity to the campaign trail and, in turn, to State government.

His policy achievements as our 38th Governor made government work better for the people by reorganizing State government, such as the creation of the department of transportation, and modernizing the National Guard. Those are just a few of the reorganizations. But through doing this, he strengthened rock-solid Iowa values in education, conservation, good government, and fiscal stewardship. It was Governor Ray who signed Iowa's—we call it the bottle bill. You get a redemption for a can you return instead of throwing it in the dump. He signed it into law to keep our roadways clean and our State looking beautiful.

Arguably, the lasting measure of his governorship is defined by moral leadership, and particularly as evidenced after the fall of Saigon in 1975.

As a result of the ending of the Vietnam war, Governor Ray's actions transcended the riverbanks of America's heartland to reach thousands of refugees across the world. Those refugees were fleeing communism in Southeast Asia. Governor Ray persuaded Presi-

dent Ford to allow Iowa to welcome the Tai Dam to Iowa, allowing this close-knit ethnic group to stay intact and to resettle in Iowa.

In 1978, we had another wave of Southeast Asians who were desperate to escape communism in South Vietnam. They became known as the boat people who put their lives in peril for the pearl of freedom that we offer in America. Bob Ray put his political life on the line to open Iowa's homes and hearts to rescue them from suffering and death. In so doing, he saved the lives of thousands of people, including generations of new Iowans yet to be born.

Yet again, Governor Ray responded in 1979 to another humanitarian crisis going on in Southeast Asia by launching the Iowa SHARES Program. The acronym "SHARES" stands for Iowa "Sends Help to Aid Refugees and End Starvation." That very first year, the program raised more than \$600,000 in less than 1 month—small donations to send food and medicine to starving people on the Cambodian border. Volunteer nurses and doctors from Iowa also went to save these people, who suffered under the harsh Khmer Rouge regime of Pol Pot.

When one of those members of the boat people first learned of Governor Ray's passing, she was moved to tears. Now a wife and mother of five children, she prayed for Governor Ray, in fact referring to him as "Saint Bob Ray." She attributed his courage and generosity to saving thousands of people just like her.

At his funeral, Senator ERNST and I saw a whole part of the church filled with these Southeast Asians who very much wanted to express their appreciation for Governor Ray's leadership by being there at that funeral.

In 2005, Governor Ray received Iowa's highest civilian honor, the Iowan Award. It is a well-deserved honor for this legendary man of honor. He is a statesman, a humanitarian hero, and, of course, to those who loved him the most, he was a husband, dad, and grandpa.

Years after Governor Ray left the Governor's mansion, called Terrace Hill, he launched the Robert D. and Billie Ray Center at Drake University. That center's mission is dedicated to improving civility and developing ethical leaders at home and throughout the world. And for all of us, we know that in a society less civil now than it has been throughout most of the history of our country, that center is going to serve a very needed purpose. For those who know the story of Bob Ray, his ray of light connected with the center will inspire generations of leaders for years to come.

Barbara and I join our fellow Iowans in extending our condolences to Billie and the entire Ray family. We will miss this extraordinary Iowan. Our State benefited in countless ways because he shared his gift so generously to make Iowa an even better place to grow for generations to come.