

really made a difference for our State and for the country as a whole.

When it comes to his distinguished career in the Senate, Fritz Hollings was at the top of anybody's list. He served for 38 years.

He was a tireless advocate for the hungry—for hunger. He was trying to combat hunger and poverty before it was cool. He traveled all over this world to try to spread the good news about America.

After Senate life, he established the Hollings Center for International Dialogue to create exchanges in dialogue between the United States and mostly Muslim populations. He was ahead of his time there. For us to win this war on terror, we have to side with people in the faith who reject radical Islam, which the overwhelming majority of people reject, and Fritz understood that.

He was a great husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He was my friend.

He had the eighth longest tour of duty in the U.S. Senate in the history of the body. Yesterday, with Senator SCOTT's help, we passed a resolution unanimously—every Senator signed on—honoring the service of Senator Hollings.

There are so many friends of his in this body. The staff and former Senators all will tell you that Fritz was a force of nature. He had strong opinions. He would share them with you whether you asked him or not. He knew what he was talking about. He was prepared. He was a fighter for his causes. He was willing to die for his country. Now he has passed, and the legacy for the people of South Carolina will be enduring.

Our beaches and our oceans and our mountains and our rivers are better off for his service. Our educational system stands out on the technical school side because of his vision. He shepherded us through very turbulent times during the civil rights movement, where other States were literally on fire. South Carolina had problems, but they paled in comparison to most because of Senator Hollings' leadership.

He was a lawyer. He loved the law. He was my friend. Senator SCOTT is from Charleston, and both of us have a tough act to follow when it comes to being Senators in South Carolina. Senator Hollings' way was to fight for your causes, work across the aisle, know what you are talking about before you speak, and try to do it with good humor. What more can you say? From the time he was a young man in Charleston until he passed away on April 6, he was always fighting for his causes. He loved his State. He delivered for the people of South Carolina.

When it comes to the Senate, he was a legend. His presence was felt up here. His legacy is enduring. He fought the good fight. He was a faithful servant, and now he will enjoy an eternal rest. To his family, I know you are grieving, but you have much to be proud of. To the people of South Carolina, it is not

about being a Republican or a Democrat in terms of service; it is about how much you love your State. No Republican and no Democrat ever loved South Carolina more than Fritz Hollings, and no Senator has ever made more of a difference than Senator Hollings.

So Senator SCOTT and I will do our best to keep up this good man's legacy. We will have different policy choices, and we will go down a different political path, but we will be ever mindful of the way we do our job. The way we do our job matters as much as what you do. Let it be said that when it came to doing his job, Fritz Hollings did it professionally, effectively, and with love and passion.

I now yield to Senator SCOTT of South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank Senator GRAHAM for yielding to me. Without any question, I think Senator GRAHAM did such a great job of distilling the life and some of the accomplishments of Senator Hollings. Without any question, I cannot imagine Mr. GRAHAM spending 36 years or so as a junior Senator from the great State of South Carolina because of the long tenure of the senior Senator, Strom Thurmond, whose seat you have. I have the privilege of being in the seat of Senator Hollings, who, of course, is from Charleston, as I am from Charleston. I think of the commonalities we all share as South Carolinians, and certainly ones who are not—all of us from South Carolina understand how hard it is to understand those folks who speak in the old Charleston brogue, the language of Senator Hollings and folks like our cousin, Arthur Ravenel, who shares the same inflection in his voice. Senator GRAHAM brought back some very fond memories with his thoughts.

To the family, the Hollings family, we certainly extend our condolences. I had the chance to speak with Michael, his son, just the other day, and the family is doing well. The family is encouraged by the outpouring of love and support from so many folks from the Senate and throughout the country because Senator Hollings was not only a South Carolina Senator, he was America's Senator. He spent a lot of time doing a lot of things that made a significant difference.

I do want to put a little meat on the bones. As Senator GRAHAM has covered so much of what I would have said, I will not say it twice. I will, perhaps, drill into a few of the times of service Senator Hollings had.

As we think through the 1960s and as we read through the 1960s, we read through a time of volatility, a time where our Nation is clashing with one another, where the races were so divided. In the Deep South, we perhaps led in that direction of conflict. We have a provocative history on race in South Carolina. Without any question, Senator Hollings did what so many others did not do, which is, he led for a peaceful integration of what is today

one of America's great public universities, Clemson University. I say that as a South Carolina fan, without any question, but it is no doubt that Harvey Gantt, being the first African American in Clemson to graduate from Clemson, was a monumental shift in southern education, one we can all celebrate today.

I went to church with Harvey Gantt's family for 20-plus years at Morris Street Baptist Church in Charleston, SC, and I will say that, perhaps as a part of the springboard of controversy and challenge and conflict, it led to a level of greatness in Harvey Gantt's life as he took arrows that most of us are unfamiliar with. Senator Hollings—then-Governor Hollings—took arrows that some would be unfamiliar with in making the decision to ask for and to encourage and support a peaceful transition in a State at the time broiled in controversy. Harvey Gantt went on, of course, to be the first African-American mayor of the city of Charlotte, NC.

In thinking about Senator GRAHAM's comments as it relates to the technical college system in South Carolina, how Senator Hollings birthed that for our State, that may sound like a good accomplishment, but for a State that faced extinction from an economic standpoint, when industries were leaving our State, the technical college system became the springboard, once again, for the great city of South Carolina to see a rebirth of our economic systems. What we have today is a manufacturing haven whose foundation is the technical college system. When we think about companies like BMW, Boeing, Volvo, Mercedes, Bosch, Michelin, Bridgestone, all these companies became a part of the corporate family in South Carolina because we had a healthy, thriving technical college system born because of the leadership of Senator Hollings.

Senator Hollings not only succeeded in public life, but he also succeeded in his private life. I will tell you that I cannot imagine the reunion between Senator Hollings and his wife, Peatsy, of over 40 years. I can't imagine the celebration that is happening in Heaven as those two are being reunited and spending time talking about what has occurred over their lifetimes and the things they had to see.

There is an amazing Greek proverb that I want to end with, as it relates to Senator Hollings, that says that a society grows when old men plant trees whose shade they know they will never sit under.

Senator GRAHAM and I, the youngsters, comparatively speaking to Senator Hollings and Senator Thurmond—we are sitting under the shade of that tree. Our Nation benefits from people who have the wisdom to look forward, beyond their lifetime, and create a country where we all benefit.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I do want to spend a few minutes

talking about what is an obvious day in our near future—tax day. Americans from coast to coast are thrilled with the opportunity to finish their taxes. I say that with the poorest tongue in cheek. I will say that without any question I am excited about this tax season because of the success of our tax reform in December 2017. It is exciting to think about the benefits to so many families throughout this country because of the successful passage of the tax reform bill in December 2017.

I stood on the floor and listened to other speakers talk about how perhaps the tax reform package has not delivered consistent with the promises made during the debate. I would like to put some meat on those bones as well.

When you think about the average family who has kids, the doubling of the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000 and allowing for more refundability to happen because of the child tax credit being increased, more families today are healthier because of the doubling of the child tax credit, which is good news. When you think about the size of the refund, \$2,873 is, in fact, consistent with the refunds of years gone by, which, once again, reinforces the fact that the tax reform bill has presented itself in a positive way and produced results consistent with what we suggested. Because if you get the same refund you had last time—about—but you have more money in your take-home pay every payday during 2018, you actually can measure the success of the tax reform by looking at how many dollars you had in your paycheck in 2018 versus 2017, even if your employer did not give you a raise. So the success of our package is without question.

I would like to suggest that as you think about folks like me, and perhaps others in this body who were raised by single parents, a single mom in 2018 with two children did not have a Federal tax burden at all until her income hit over \$54,000. That is important, and it is powerful for a specific reason. The average single mother makes around \$40,000 a year, not \$54,000. That means that for the average single mother in America, because of the success of our tax reform package, her Federal tax burden is down to zero. That is not just good news, that is great news. I know it personally because of a single mother who worked 16 hours a day trying to keep food on the table. Having doubled the child tax credit and having lowered her taxes by doubling the standard deduction from \$9,300 to \$18,000, what we see for the single mom is hope and a light at the end of the tunnel that is not a train. This is good news.

Not only is it good news, but some have talked about our plan—we have defaulted on our mission to help the American people. I suggest that as opposed to defaulting on our mission, what we heard from others is that they are deflated because of the success of our mission. During the previous administration, GDP growth averaged

somewhere around 2 percent. In 2018, we saw a 3.1-percent GDP growth. What does that mean for the average person? What it means for the average person is that for the first time in a long time, more than a decade, we saw their wages grow over 3 percent. So not only did their wages grow over 3 percent, but, more importantly, they had more jobs—actually, not just more jobs. This is really good news. They had more jobs. So many more jobs are open today than people looking for work. In other words, if you think about the number of folks looking for work, the number of openings exceeds that number. That is a transformation in this country in a way we have very seldom seen or experienced.

There is even more good news to that. Our unemployment rate is down to nearly a 50-year low, 3.8 percent. So if we are asking ourselves what these corporations did with the money, we are seeing the evolution or the manifestation of what happened with these extra resources by seeing the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years. Now, that is not just true for America as a whole, it is true for the subgroups within America who have been challenged and sometimes excluded from the workforce. The African-American unemployment rate is around 7 percent over the last 2 years. You have to compare that to, under the previous administration, an unemployment rate of around 12 percent. The Hispanic unemployment is near 5 percent. You have to compare that to a 50-percent increase under the previous administration.

We have seen perhaps the greatest renaissance in our country, economically, than we have seen in 20 years, and much of it is due to tax reform being passed. Embedded in the tax reform package was my signature legislation that I am so excited about, the opportunity zones legislation, that is having a transformative impact and effect throughout the poorest, most distressed communities in all of our country. Somewhere around 8,000 opportunity zones have been designated by the Governors in collaboration with the mayors. Mr. President, as a former Governor, you understand better than most of us the process by which one went through in order to establish the zones and the potential of those zones in the most distressed communities in each of the States.

There is good news. The good news is, in places like my home State of South Carolina, is a logistics company named DHL that drives those little yellow vans that ship some of your packages across the country. They are investing \$100 million in a distribution and warehouse park, creating nearly 500 jobs in Dorchester County, and they have said the Federal opportunity zone designation was a factor DHL weighed in making this location decision.

In Washington State, the Vancouver Downtown Redevelopment Authority president said: "It's an absolute no-

brainer, and a real gift from the federal government and will give us a real shot in the arm in these areas"—these challenged, distressed communities.

In Vegas, the largest opportunity zone expo in the Nation is being held next month with some of the biggest names across the country trying to figure out how they can reinvest their resources in areas where they were unwilling to take a second look, because now the incentive is good enough, and we did so without more bureaucrats and without government money. These are private-sector dollars being deployed in some of the most distressed communities.

In the Midwest, up to 3,000 jobs are on the way to East Chicago, and a local foundation is looking to invest \$800 million in a solar farm in Flint, MI. There are so many other States with amazing projects that I would run out of time talking about those.

I will close with two thoughts. One is from Mayor Bowser of DC. She had a March Madness event for opportunity zones, and she attracted 400-plus folks who are interested in investing and seeing the results of the investments in the local community here in DC.

For folks on the left and on the right, African Americans, Hispanics, Whites, Asians, this is a policy that brings America together. Whether you live in the most affluent communities or the most distressed communities, Americans are looking at opportunity zones as a way to have a conversation with each other. If there is one thing that we all would agree upon, it is that America needs to talk a little more with each other in a civil way about fairness and opportunity.

One of the reasons why I started my national opportunity tour is to highlight some of the successes—from Miami, with my good friend MARCO RUBIO, to Boston, New Hampshire, and West Virginia, with Senator CAPITO, to Iowa, with Senator ERNST, and Colorado, Arizona, and so many other places. I look forward to continuing the conversation and distilling the benefits of the opportunity zones over the next few months.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am honored to be cochairing the Entrepreneurship Caucus with the Senator from South Carolina. He is right that there are some great examples of people who want to get businesses started and who want to pursue their dreams, and we need to highlight those because we have a lot of people who right now have some great new ideas. If we are going to continue to be a country that is an incubator for those ideas, then, we have to promote those ideas and allow those people to follow their dreams.

NOMINATION OF DAVID BERNHARDT

Mr. President, I am here today to join many of my colleagues in discussing the nomination of David Bernhardt to be Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

I have serious concerns about many of the actions that Mr. Bernhardt has taken while serving as both Deputy Secretary of the Department, since 2017, and as Acting Secretary, since the resignation of Secretary Zinke in January. Some of the most concerning actions include defending the administration's budget request, which zeroed out funding for the newly reauthorized Land and Water Conservation Fund; rolling back protections for public lands, including proposals to reduce the size of some of our national monuments; limiting opportunities for public input into Agency rulemakings; and weakening enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

These actions have threatened the responsible and sustainable management of our public lands, imperiled laws designed to protect and conserve wildlife, and stacked the deck in favor of fossil fuel industries.

One particular area that I would like to focus on today is how Mr. Bernhardt has played a role in the Department of the Interior's decisions to rescind Obama-era climate and conservation policies that directed Agency employees to minimize the environmental impact of activities on Federal land. In a secretarial order published just before Christmas in 2017, which was signed by Mr. Bernhardt, the Department limited how its employees at sub-Agencies, like the Bureau of Land Management, can factor climate and environmental effects into their decision making. What does this mean, exactly? Well, it means that manuals, handbooks, and other lists of best practices that were compiled by Agency employees over the years—career Agency employees—that were meant to minimize activities that would harm species or accelerate climate change were thrown out or their instructions were rendered obsolete.

Mr. Bernhardt has not only downplayed climate science and prevented efforts to mitigate it within the Department of the Interior, but he has also advanced policy and rulemakings that will accelerate its effect. We all know what we are up against here with climate change. We have seen the weather events throughout the country—the heating of our ocean waters; the increase in hurricanes; the predictions of how many metropolitan areas are going to be experiencing significant flooding in just the next few decades; the wildfires that we have seen in Arizona, Colorado, and California; and the video of the dad in Northern California driving his daughter through lapping wildfires, leaving their house burning behind them as they drove and he sang to her to calm her down. Those are the big effects and the little effects, but Americans know this is happening.

So the question is not, Is it happening? We know it is because every one of these things was predicted by our scientists and was predicted by our military. The question is, What do we do about it? That is why I am so opposed to the administration's decision to get out of the international climate change agreement, and I am opposed to its decision to get us out of the Clean Power rules that we had just started to put forward and to implement, and why I am opposed to the decision it made to reverse the gas mileage standards.

Unfortunately, Mr. Bernhardt has not only downplayed climate change, but he has also helped, as I said, to advance policy that accelerates it. For example, in September 2018, the Bureau of Land Management announced a draft rule that would relax the Obama-era methane rules that regulated flared, leaked, and vented natural gas from oil and gas operations on Federal and Tribal lands. Methane is an extremely potent greenhouse gas that according to the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has an impact that is 34 times greater over a 100-year period than carbon dioxide. It is also important to remember that these proposed rescissions to methane rules are in direct opposition and run counter to the Senate's vote in 2017 to reject an effort at full repeal under the Congressional Review Act. Instead of going backward, we should be taking real action to combat climate change. We need a comprehensive approach to greenhouse gas emissions, and we need energy efficient technologies and homegrown energy resources. I also believe, as I noted, that we should reinstate the Clean Power rules and the gas mileage standards.

Under Mr. Bernhardt's leadership, the Department of the Interior has been taking us in the wrong direction on climate, conservation, and public lands. I will oppose his nomination.

NOMINATION OF DAVID STEVEN MORALES

Mr. President, before I conclude, I wish to make brief remarks on the nomination of David Morales to be a Federal judge for the Southern District of Texas, who was just confirmed yesterday evening. Yesterday the Senate began its consideration on this nomination at 4 p.m. and voted on the confirmation around 6 p.m.

Under the new rules, we had just about 2 hours of time on the Senate floor to debate the nomination for a lifetime appointment to the Federal judiciary. I would have liked to have made these comments before that time. But with these severe limits, it is very difficult for Senators, if they have other obligations within the building or constituent visits or hearings going on, to be able to make it within the 2-hour period that we are now allowed, which is actually a 1-hour period.

There was much more to be concerned about with respect to this nominee, which is why I am making these comments now. To name one example, during his time in the Texas Attorney

General's Office, he has participated in cases that have undermined American voting rights. In 2007 he submitted an amicus brief before the Supreme Court in support of an Indiana voter ID law. The brief argued that requiring voters to have photo IDs was only "a negligible burden on the right to vote." They should ask that of some of our seniors in Minnesota who have voted for decades and decades and decades and are well-known by election officials and, in our State, are able to show up at the voting booth and be able to vote or maybe they don't have a driver's license because they no longer drive. These are examples that go on across the United States. In many States that have these restrictions, these people are literally turned away from voting.

It is one of the reasons that the voters of my State turned away a proposal that was on our ballot to have these restrictive photo-ID requirements. It sounds good, but then when you really look under the hood, you find that it limits voting. It was especially difficult for people in our rural areas and our seniors to accept this change, and they didn't.

We also know that voter ID laws have a disproportionate impact on voters who are low income, racial and ethnic minorities, elderly, and people with disabilities.

The nominee also defended Texas's ban on same-sex marriage. In 2010 he signed on to a brief arguing that Texas had a right to ban same-sex marriage. The Supreme Court rejected similar arguments in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, which found that the Constitution guarantees the right to marry for same-sex couples.

These issues are about how our democracy functions and about treating people equally under the law and with respect.

It is the Senate's constitutional responsibility to give its advice and consent on lifetime nominees to the Federal bench. These nominations are too important to turn the Senate into a mere rubberstamp. The Senate must maintain its role as a meaningful check and balance in our constitutional system, and I join my colleagues in expressing my deep concern about the pace at which we are confirming these nominees.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 1116

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Mr. President. Today I rise to speak about the legislation I introduced to the Senate this week, S. 1116, the BROWSER ACT.