



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2019

No. 70

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign Lord, our help in ages past and our hope for years to come, we magnify Your Name. Lord, we sense that our battles are not simply with flesh and blood, but we war against principalities and powers. Thank You for providing us with spiritual weapons for our warfare. Forgive us when we chase the temporary and flee from the permanent. Inspire us to capture our thoughts and actions, making them subject to Your will.

Lord, give our lawmakers today an awareness of the complexity of the warfare between good and evil. Speak to our Senators when they call to You for guidance. Remind them that truth crushed to Earth will rise again.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Cooper, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate is in the midst of considering several more well-qualified nominees for service in the executive branch and on our Nation's Federal courts. We are doing so in a more reasonable, efficient manner—more in line with this body's tradition—thanks to the modest reform the Senate passed just a few weeks ago.

Until recently, our colleagues across the aisle had succeeded in subjecting even the least controversial nominees to day after day of so-called debate.

Countless hours of valuable floor time were spent on individuals who passed through committees of jurisdiction without any opposition and for individuals whose final confirmation votes frequently cleared 90 votes, but now the Senate has begun to clear the backlog and put more public servants to work on behalf of the American people.

Last evening we voted to advance the nomination of William Cooper of Maryland to serve as general counsel at the Department of Energy. Mr. Cooper's nomination first arrived in the Senate 9 months ago. It has twice been reported favorably by our colleagues on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Mr. Cooper of Florida has

waited even longer to begin his service as Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, and the story is not much different for the jurists waiting to finally be confirmed to Federal district courts either.

So I look forward to the swift consideration of this week's slate of nominees, and I would urge each of my colleagues to join me in voting for their confirmation.

#### HEALTHCARE

On another matter, lest there be any doubt that my Democratic colleagues here in the Congress are serious about their party's radical left turn, the House Rules Committee is actually holding a hearing today on their proposal to outlaw private health insurance and force every American into a new government-run system.

As I have said, this grand scheme ought to be called Medicare for None. Democrats want to drain the popular program that seniors have relied on for more than 50 years and slap its name on a brand-new, untried, untested government-run system, and this thing they have cooked up would become the only option—the only option—available to American families.

Democrats are so confident that Americans will love their one-size-fits-all government plan that they feel the need to ban the private sector from competing with it.

This is a fantasy pulled from the farthest corners of the left, but now leading Democrats are proudly embracing it.

Here is the chairman of the House Rules Committee: "It's a serious proposal that deserves serious consideration."

Well, it certainly is a serious proposal for more than 180 million Americans who would be unceremoniously kicked off of their private insurance plans. It certainly is a serious proposal for the tens of millions of Americans who paid into Medicare so it would actually be there now when they needed

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2497

it—not distorted into something totally different.

This is a particularly important point, given the serious challenges that Medicare is already facing. The Administrator for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services recently explained that “the program’s main trust fund for hospital services can only pay full benefits for seven more years,” and she noted the particular irony that this “sobering dose of reality” is being delivered as “some are calling for a complete government takeover of the American healthcare system.”

On our current trajectory, as soon as 7 years from now, in 2026, “doctors, hospitals, and nursing homes would not receive their full compensation from the program and patients could face more of the financial burden.” That is from the New York Times.

In other words, this is a time for shoring up the existing health insurance that our seniors like and rely on, not a time to risk it—risk it all—by packing millions and millions more—the whole rest of the Nation—into that very system for the sake of a snappy campaign promise.

The last time Democrats had unified control of the House, the Senate, and the White House, of course, they implemented sweeping changes that the American people were assured would keep healthcare costs down. Lots of promises were made. Lots of promises were broken.

Many families are now saddled with sky-high premiums, deductibles, and out-of-pocket costs, not to mention dwindling choices, and now Democrats are back for another, even bigger bite of the apple.

The last thing American families need is even more top-down, one-size-fits-all social engineering. We need to take practical steps to address what really matters most to American families—healthcare costs. We need to preserve what works, fix what doesn’t, bring costs down, and preserve Medicare. That is the sensible approach that American families deserve. That is the practical solutions-oriented approach that Republicans are committed to.

But as we have already seen across the Capitol this week, our Democratic friends want to wheel out the drawing board yet again and take another big whack at the healthcare plans Americans already rely on.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN ABEGG

Madam President, on one final matter, one of the most bittersweet subjects that Senators discuss on the floor is the departure of trusted staff. On one hand, I am certainly glad for any opportunity to highlight members of my all-star team, especially someone as diligent and tireless as the subject of my remarks today. The vast majority of the late-night hours and weekend projects that go on around here are repaid with much private gratitude but little to no public fanfare. So I am glad I can devote some time today to a long-

time adviser who has earned my complete trust and thrown himself heart, mind, and soul into serving Kentucky and our Nation for nearly two decades.

But I am very unhappy that the occasion for this is that John Abegg is taking leave of the Senate to pursue the next chapter for himself and his family. John, you see, is my chief counsel. He arrived on our team before I was whip and before I was leader. President Clinton was still in office, and it was one of the more fortunate days of my career when this bright, young lawyer walked into my office. He brought an outsized share of shrewd judgment, sharp wit, and an eagle eye for detail along with him.

Some 19 years later, nearly all of that is still the case. There might be a little more seasoning. The reading glasses might be a little thicker. But every ounce of the talent and dedication that were so evident back then have remained part of my operation ever since.

John has literally flourished. He has become an institution in his own right here in the Senate and in the legal community, and I feel so fortunate to have had him by my side.

Now, today, it may all sound quite impressive—the chief counsel who advises the Senate majority leader on judicial nominations and countless important policy matters. But John can attest that the original job description 19 years ago wasn’t so glamorous.

It was the beginning of the 107th Congress. I secured a temporary seat on the Judiciary Committee. It was an important assignment, but it came with some caveats. Namely, I would be last on the docket to speak at hearings. So most often, as a courtesy, I would yield my speaking time and avoid holding up the proceedings.

But this will give you a picture of how unbelievably industrious and meticulous John is, because my bright, young counsel saw this as a zero license to slack off or let up on the comprehensive briefing books he would prepare for me.

No matter how many times I opted only to listen and cast my vote, the painstaking, encyclopedic preparations came pouring in—just in case. I may have been the new guy on the block, but John made sure that every week I showed up loaded for bear, with extensive background information, potential amendments, and suggested questions, because, you see, John Abegg is never, ever caught flat-footed—not ever, and if you are around him, he will not let you be caught flat-footed either. For John, a job worth doing is a job worth doing to perfection—or as close to perfection as possible.

The man literally handled everything from nominations to policy matters to his own colleagues’ questions about Senate ethics. Now, all of that was in a half-day’s work, by the way, and yet every one of these subjects, every single time, was handled with total commitment, stunning professionalism,

and the utmost care. Zero stones were left unturned, zero angles left unconsidered—a true “lawyer’s lawyer” from dawn until well after dusk, and then all over again.

We are talking about a mindset that you would think even a top professional might reserve for one marquee project every couple of months. John brought that high standard to 14 different things before lunchtime, and he did it every day for almost 20 years.

Now, I realize that the picture I have painted so far may sound like an incredible team asset but not necessarily the most warm and fuzzy individual. It is true that John was never afraid to state his views directly to his peers or his chief of staff or to me. Now, I am not sure anyone on my staff has been able to deliver hard news, when necessary, with more clarity or greater courage, but he has been equally reliable for the best laugh line in most meetings, the perfectly timed joke. He literally lifts everyone up by bringing the house down.

And for all of the priorities he juggles, anybody who has seen John in the presence of his lovely wife and their three girls knows exactly what his real top priority is.

During his tenure, John has offered me peerless advice and analysis on countless judicial nominations. A majority of the sitting Supreme Court was confirmed while John has been on this job. He takes the judiciary as seriously as it deserves. The third branch and our Nation are better for his service.

Then, there is a lengthy catalog of legislative work that John has steered and helped me to shape. Some of his legacy is what you might expect from a no-nonsense lawyer for a Republican Member of this body—work on causes like class action reform or medical liability reform.

But anyone who spent time around John would be equally unsurprised by the long nights he put in to help bring about comprehensive legislation to address the opioid crisis or crack down on the scourge of human trafficking or to help local law enforcement care for fallen officers’ families and search for missing children. In every single case, John was on the case—rock-solid legal advice, keen strategy. Before an issue even popped up, he would have his finger on the pulse of the Senate.

Once we were in the thick of it, he was often our field general and backbone, and after our work was done, but only then, it was time for a well-earned smile.

But John’s smile is widest when he is talking about his beautiful wife Heidi and their three lovely daughters, Abigail, Ingrid, and Erika.

So while his friends and colleagues here in the Senate are sad to see John go, we know he does nothing rashly, and so we are confident that he has thought this calculus through as completely as he has everything else.

Fewer full-day hearings and more bedtime stories. Fewer dinners crackling up his colleagues over takeout food

during some all-night session and more times at his own kitchen table.

Well, after nearly two decades, I suppose we can let this slacker head for the hills, and we will know that he has made the right call because John Abegg is the one who made it.

So I really can't thank him enough for his loyal friendship, wise counsel, and exceptionally well done job.

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

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

#### MEDICARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, shortly before Easter, the junior Senator from Vermont introduced a new version of his so-called Medicare for All plan. Given the staggering pricetag of his previous plan, it was reasonable to wonder if he would think about producing something that was at least a bit more modest and achievable. So what is the new plan like? Is it any more realistic? Did he figure out a way to actually pay for a government takeover of healthcare? Well, the answer is no. In fact, the new plan is even worse. It is more unrealistic, more costly, and even more likely to result in massive tax hikes on middle-class Americans.

Analysis of a previous version of the Vermont Senator's Medicare for All plan found that it would cost \$32 trillion over 10 years. Now, to put that number in perspective, that is more money than the Federal Government has spent combined in the last 8 years on everything—defense, law enforcement, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, agriculture, Foreign Affairs—everything.

Here is what the Washington Post had to say back in 2017 about the pricetag for government-run healthcare:

But the government's price tag would be astonishing. When Sen. Bernie Sanders . . . proposed a "Medicare for all" health plan in his presidential campaign, the nonpartisan Urban Institute figured that it would raise government spending by \$32 trillion over 10 years, requiring a tax increase so huge that even the democratic socialist Mr. Sanders did not propose anything close to it.

Fast-forward to today, and, once again, the Senator from Vermont has proposed a government-run health plan without even coming close to presenting a way to pay for it. The only difference this time is that the pricetag is likely to be even higher—much higher. Why? Because the Senator from Vermont's new plan also includes coverage for long-term care—an incredibly expensive part of the healthcare system.

The Democrats' last attempt to have the government run a long-term care program fell apart before it was even implemented because the program was

not financially viable. Thirty-two trillion dollars was a staggering enough figure, and now we are talking about having the Federal Government spend even more. Where do the Democrats think we are going to find the money? The list of proposed tax hikes that the Senator from Vermont released would not even come close to covering the estimated cost of his original plan, much less the cost of his new, expanded Medicare fantasy. This is not a plan that can be paid for by using the Democrats' favorite solution of taxing the rich. If Medicare for All ever became law, it would be paid for on the backs of middle-class families.

It is impossible to have a discussion of Medicare for All—or maybe we should call it Medicare for None given the fact that it would end Medicare as we know it—without focusing on the insane pricetag. Yet that is not the only unrealistic aspect of this bill. The Senator from Vermont is proposing to implement his plan in 4 years. That is right—in 4 years. The Obama administration had 3½ years to implement the ObamaCare exchanges, which were intended to cover a tiny fraction of the number of people who would be covered under Medicare for All. As I am sure most Americans remember, the government couldn't put together a working website in that time period. The idea that the government could successfully transition more than 180 million Americans into government-run healthcare in the space of 4 years is ludicrous, not to mention what that healthcare would be like when Americans would have made it into the system.

As a recent Vox article pointed out, the Senator from Vermont is proposing extremely generous benefits—benefits that are substantially more generous than those that are offered by other countries with government-run healthcare. Yet, again, he has no viable way of paying for any of this. The likelihood that Americans would actually see all of those benefits is slim.

When the government reaches a point where it can't pay for all of the benefits it promised, it has basically two options. It can raise taxes even further—and that would undoubtedly happen; I think that is a given—but the government would also inevitably have to turn to the other option: the kind of control over healthcare we have seen in other countries with socialized medicine. Americans would also undoubtedly soon find themselves facing that other hallmark of socialized medicine: long wait times for care.

The leader recently said on the floor that Republicans stand for "preserving what works and fixing what doesn't." That is exactly it. Republicans know that our healthcare system is not perfect. We are committed to finding solutions to make healthcare more affordable, but we don't think tearing down our entire system is the answer. We can address the healthcare challenges we face without ripping away Americans' health insurance and forcing

them into a government-run, one-size-fits-all plan and then raising their taxes to pay for it. We can make healthcare more affordable without destroying Medicare as we know it.

Democrats' socialist healthcare fantasy sounds nice in theory, but the reality would be anything but—huge new tax hikes for the middle class, long wait times and lower quality of care, government involvement in your healthcare decisions, and no choice at all when it comes to your insurance.

Let's hope the Democratic Party halts its mad rush to the extreme left before Americans are forced to live under the ugly reality of socialized medicine.

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

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

#### NOMINATION OF R. CLARKE COOPER

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in support of the nomination of R. Clarke Cooper to be an Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs at the Department of State.

The Bureau of Political-Military Affairs plays a critical role in the State Department and in broader diplomatic and national security efforts around the world. Every day, the Bureau works to ensure that our foreign policy goals are driving our security partnerships and security assistance around the world, including nearly \$100 billion annually in arms sales.

I am prepared to support Mr. Cooper's nomination as Assistant Secretary because I believe he brings experience, insight, and leadership that will benefit the Bureau and our foreign policy. I also expect Mr. Cooper to uphold the commitments he made during his confirmation hearing, including that he will not only be responsive to all inquiries from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and its staff about the Bureau's work but that he will also proactively keep us fully informed about issues under his jurisdiction.

#### 3D GUNS

Madam President, if confirmed by the Senate, Mr. Cooper will assume his position at a time when the Bureau is at the center of, quite frankly, some appalling decisions by the Trump administration that will undermine the safety and security of Americans abroad.

I cannot wrap my head around the administration's policies, for example, on the issue of 3D-printed firearms. The Trump administration apparently believes it is a good idea to indiscriminately distribute around the world—to foreign adversaries, terrorist organizations, and future mass shooters—the literal blueprints for using 3D printers

to make nearly undetectable firearms and components.

Apparently, the Trump administration believes this information should be readily available to anyone as it seeks to transfer the export control licensing of military-style firearms and ammunition from the Department of State to the less stringent Department of Commerce. Even the Commerce Department has admitted that its own regulations will not permit them to effectively stop the publication of these firearm blueprints online.

It is not difficult to imagine the devastating consequences of this reckless decision, which will make more lethal weapons available to more thuggish regimes and facilitate their illicit transfer to criminals and terrorists. We are talking about making it easier for a criminal to build his own weapons without having to get a background check. We are talking about making it easier for terrorists to board a plane with deadly guns, perhaps to hijack them and use the aircraft as weapons, just as the 9/11 terrorists did. We are talking about making it easier for armed militants to enter a U.S. Embassy undetected, endangering the lives of our diplomats abroad. Simply put, we are talking about preventable tragedies made possible by the thoughtless actions of this administration. These are undetectable. That is the big challenge here. Indeed, this decision could place all American citizens and officials—even the President himself—at greater security risk.

It is not too late to reverse this mistake. The Trump administration can halt its decision to transfer the export jurisdiction to the Commerce Department. At the very least, the administration could leave the blueprints for producing undetectable, 3D-printed firearms under the stronger regulatory controls of the Department of State.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

Madam President, on a separate note, I have made clear to Mr. Cooper that the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs has a moral and strategic imperative to consider human rights and end-use monitoring when it comes to making decisions about arms sales, transfers, and security assistance to foreign countries.

Over the past 2 years, it has been troubling to see human rights considerations take a backseat. That includes the President's recent decision to revise the Conventional Arms Transfer Policy to disregard a country's human rights record. With Saudi Arabia, the Khashoggi murder, and the debacle of the Yemen war fresh on our minds, we need no reminder of the consequences of the President's impulse to put profit above all else, including respect for basic human rights. Human rights are not just a nice gesture; they are fundamental American values and critical to advancing peace, justice, democracy, and stability around the world.

We must ask ourselves what we as a nation want America to be. Are we a

beacon of hope for the oppressed or simply the biggest arms merchant to the world? Count me and many of my colleagues as standing firmly for the former, and I hope Mr. Cooper will stand with us.

#### NOMINATION PROCESS

Madam President, finally, for weeks, we have heard from the President, the majority leader, and other Republicans about vacancies at the State Department and why that contributed to the supposed need for Senator McConnell to exercise the nuclear option on nominees. As I recently explained on the floor, Republicans need to point the finger at their President. In many cases, the President has simply failed to put forward nominees for key national security positions. When he does put forward nominees, too often these individuals have not been thoroughly vetted, and issues that would be disqualifying for nominees in any other administration have simply been glossed over.

It turns out there is another issue that speaks directly to the flimsiness of the majority leader's rationale for invoking the nuclear option, and that is the fact that Republicans themselves are blocking State Department nominees, including career employees nominated to be Ambassadors to Ecuador and Cambodia. These nominees were reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee by voice vote and without any controversies several weeks ago.

They could have been confirmed and on the ground in their posts prior to Easter recess. Instead, their nominations are languishing because the majority leader has refused to move. So I now call on Senator McConnell to stop playing politics with the State Department and get these career nominees confirmed.

As I have said repeatedly, when presented with qualified, well-vetted nominees, my staff and I will work around the clock to advance the confirmation process. I would ask for the same from my Republican colleagues.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### REMEMBERING RICHARD LUGAR

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, over the weekend, Indiana lost a giant in Richard G. Lugar. Senator Lugar spent 36 years as a Member of this body, and I rise today to celebrate his life, which made the world a better, safer place to live.

I had the pleasure in the early 2000s to work on Senator Lugar's staff, and I had a front row seat to history, watching a true statesman at work. He stood by me as I took my oath right here in

this Chamber. I will never forget his support of me and of so many others throughout the years.

Senator Lugar's reserved and quiet demeanor sometimes might have led people to believe he was something less than competitive. In truth, he was one of the most competitive people I have ever encountered. Senator Lugar was a runner, and his office competed every year in the Capital Challenge, the competitive race between legislative staffs. Senator Lugar had a member of his staff actually track everyone's time and their improvement, or lack thereof, from year to year. I think that spreadsheet still exists somewhere today. When I was going through the hiring process to be a legislative assistant in the Senator's office, I went through the normal series of questions—my academic background, my professional experiences, my policy knowledge, my interest in working in the office. But at the very end of the interview, the Senator asked me a pointed question. He led into the question by indicating that he had seen listed some hobbies on my résumé, and one of those hobbies was running. So he asked me pointedly: How fast can you run 3 miles? I quickly told him I thought I could break 18 minutes. A half hour later, I got a phone call saying I was hired. Looking back, I am not so sure it was because of my policy chops.

I learned a lot working for this man. I fondly remember his penchant for ice cream and the stacks and stacks of books in his office. I believe he read every one.

Senator Lugar would from time to time invite staff members or interns to run with him on the Mall. There was one rule: Never ever run in front of the Senator. He was, after all, a leader, a Rhodes Scholar, a Navy veteran, mayor of Indianapolis where he spurred economic growth, which is still spoken of today, by consolidating the city and county governments into Univox.

As a U.S. Senator, he led on food security, energy independence, and free trade. At a time when nuclear proliferation was regarded as civilization's greatest threat, Senator Lugar helped save the world. The Nunn-Lugar Act, for which he is most well known, has led to the securing and destruction of thousands of weapons of mass destruction and delivery devices.

Dick Lugar was a very shrewd politician until his last days. His instincts were very good. I know this from personal experience. In fact, last year, he and I did a forum together at Indiana University. Present on the panel were a former World Food Prize winner, the leader of an international NGO, Senator Lugar, and I. After formal presentations were done and some questions were asked by the moderator, questions were opened up to the audience. Some particularly difficult questions were tendered initially, and whenever one of those questions was asked, Senator Lugar would put on that trademark smile of his—and everyone back

home knows what I am talking about. He would just look over at me and let the junior Senator from Indiana field that question. After about three or four times, I decided it was his turn, so I tried to use his method right back at him. He simply smiled back at me until I couldn't stand the silence anymore. I was the first to break. The man still had the gift. The entire audience laughed. He was not to be underestimated.

He was not to be underestimated as a boss in the impact he could have on a young, idealistic staffer looking for role models in public life. He was not to be underestimated as a mentor who understood that the most important thing a leader can do is to simply set a good example—comport yourself in a way that others might want to model. He was not to be underestimated as a human being. Richard Lugar had a heart. He ran for office not to be somebody, but to do things, important things to improve the lives of hundreds of millions—in the end, billions of people around the world.

Dick Lugar was the gold standard. He leaves a legacy as an exemplar of wisdom, civility, and bipartisanship. Always staying true to his temperament, he was a quiet man, a dignified statesman. He thought before he spoke. He emphasized substance over personality. In short, he set the bar for public leaders, and he set it high. I would go further and say that he set the bar high for leaders, more generally.

We should all look to Dick Lugar. We should all learn from his example.

I am not sure we will ever see another Richard Lugar. I sure pray we do. May God watch over him and his family during this difficult time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, you just heard the story from Senator YOUNG. He had the benefit of knowing Richard Lugar more recently.

My story is a little different. I am going to have to think back to 45 years ago. I was between my sophomore and junior years at Wabash College. I never knew I had an interest in politics, let alone that someday I would be serving in the Lugar seat. How life drives you in certain directions.

I remember that Richard Lugar took on Senator Birch Bayh, who I think had served several terms—he recently passed away himself, another icon of Hoosier politics—and I said that I wanted to get involved. When you have a man like Richard Lugar, who took a risk, stuck his neck out to run for mayor after he had been on a school board—ironically, I was on a school board for 10 years when I decided to stick my neck out to run for State legislator—you think back about how life drives you in certain directions.

With Richard Lugar, most notably, during his entire life, he lived with character and integrity.

I think back to when I first met him. I was dressed in a white turtleneck

with a blue blazer and plaid pants. Wow, I can't believe we even dressed that way back in the seventies. I found those pictures stored away in a box about 4 or 5 years ago. I pulled them out, and my high school sweetheart, my wife now—she and I were looking at Dick as he was preparing to run for Senate. The look on our faces, looking into the face of someone with his stature, really stood out.

When you get this far down the trail, I get asked: Who were your mentors who got you to run for school board, State rep, and then the Senate? Mostly, it would have been my parents and my community. I say that often. But if there was one politician I would have looked up to, even when I wasn't certain I ever wanted to get involved in politics at all, I would look back to that year, back in the midseventies, when I decided to do it.

He was in the Senate for a long time. During the entirety of his terms, he always did it to where, as a Hoosier and as an American, you were proud of him. The thing he did as well as anyone is that he was able to look across the aisle in times when we were less polarized. Now, I think that trait, more than ever, would be something we need to pay attention to.

When you close the chapter on one individual's life, one whose life was as exemplary as Richard Lugar's, it should mostly be inspiration for others to follow in his footsteps.

I know in the State of Indiana—in an op-ed that was just put out by an individual, it cites Richard Lugar as the most important public servant ever to come from our State. Gosh, I think you would have to say there was a lot of credibility to push that point of view.

All I can tell you is that for the time I am here in the Lugar seat, I intend to do what he did. On things he knew a little something about, he stuck his neck out, made a statement, and he led. In the entirety of his career here in the Senate, he was impeccable in his integrity and character. Gosh, we could sure use a good dose of that in this day and age.

It is an honor for me to be serving in his seat, and I hope to do even half as good a job in my stint here as he did over many, many years.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

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

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the upcoming vote.

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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Ex.]

#### YEAS—68

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Jones	Shaheen
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Sinema
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Van Hollen
Enzi	Moran	Warner
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Paul	

#### NAYS—31

Baldwin	Heinrich	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Booker	Leahy	Smith
Brown	Markey	Stabenow
Cardin	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Harris

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.

The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked, the postcloture time on the R. Clarke Cooper nomination expire at 2:15 p.m. today. I further ask that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. Finally, I ask that following the cloture vote on the R. Clarke Cooper nomination, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### 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 bill 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 R. Clarke Cooper, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs).

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Mike Crapo, John Hoeven, Johnny Isakson,