

beyond Hong Kong. It matters to us. It should matter to us. What is happening in Hong Kong is not just important for those residents but for the rest of the world. Today the people of Hong Kong are fighting against an unpopular and unfair extradition bill. They are really fighting for a future in which they can enjoy basic human rights, natural rights that everyone should have, including the right to free speech, the right to a fair trial, the right to be confident that your government will follow the laws of the society in which it exists, and participation in a just and fair representative system of government.

If the Chinese officials in Beijing and the Communist Chinese who rule mainland China have their way, they will extinguish these rights for the people of Hong Kong. If the extradition bill were to become law, it would threaten all of those rights because of the chilling effect of the threat of being extradited to the lawlessness of the Chinese judicial system.

In some important ways, I think Hong Kong can be seen as a canary in a coal mine for Asia. What happens in Hong Kong will at least set expectations, create a climate that will maybe affect what happens in Taiwan over time, other Asian nations that are struggling for freedom in the shadow of China. The fact is, China itself is controlled by an authoritarian government, interested primarily in its own survival. That is the top priority of Beijing's leadership. They have created a modern-day police state. They use mass surveillance, censorship, internet applications in order to control their own citizens. They have imprisoned over a million of their own citizens, the Muslim Uighur minorities, in concentration camps.

China's authoritarianism threatens free and open societies all around the world. A democratic Hong Kong is a direct threat to the Communist regime in Beijing because people across China, naturally, ask the question: Why do Hongkongers get to have more rights and a better life and more freedom than we have? That is the threat the government in Beijing is trying to extinguish.

We, of course, recently had the blessing of being able to celebrate our own Independence Day, when Americans reflect on our own struggle against tyranny, against an unjust government, and our successful effort to throw that off and establish this, the world's greatest, most vibrant, and freest democratic society.

In many ways, the Hongkongers are fighting for some of the very same values as our Founding Fathers did during the American Revolution. I think it is important that we in the United States not turn a blind eye to the struggle for freedom that is happening outside our borders. I think it is important that Americans continue to stand in support of the voices in Hong Kong calling for freedom, for democracy, and re-

spect for basic human rights. I will do what I can in the Senate to support the people of Hong Kong in their peaceful protests for their own freedom, and I call on my colleagues in this administration to join me.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, if I understand the procedure, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are postcloture on the Bress nomination.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to oppose the nomination of Daniel Bress to the Ninth Circuit in California.

First, by history and tradition, this is a California seat on the Ninth Circuit. The fact is that Mr. Bress is neither a California attorney nor a California resident. In fact, he has not been a resident of the State for over a decade. He has lived and practiced in the Washington, DC, area for almost his entire adult life.

As California Senators, Senator HARRIS and I know that experience and connection to California are really necessary for a Ninth Circuit judge to be effective on the bench. We know our State, we know our constituents, and we know the challenges they face.

That is why the blue slip is so important. Honoring the blue slip ensures that Senators who understand and are accountable to their constituents have a say in judicial nominations for their home States.

Senator HARRIS's and my blue slips were not returned. That ultimately symbolizes our objections. I was also very disappointed that the White House ignored that and moved forward with Mr. Bress's nomination.

Senator HARRIS and I worked in good faith with the White House to find nominees acceptable to the President and to us. During our negotiations that took place, we informed the White House that we could support several other nominees who were, in fact, selected by the White House. Yet the White House and the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee have claimed we were at an impasse. That is simply not true. For reasons still unknown to us, the White House abandoned our negotiations and nominated Mr. Bress for this seat instead.

I am very disappointed that Republican leadership decided to schedule a vote on Mr. Bress's nomination, given both of our objections to his nomination and our concerns about a lack of connection to our State.

Next, I want to discuss what I mean by a lack of connection to our State.

The White House has greatly exaggerated Mr. Bress's connections to California to justify their decision to move forward with a non-California nominee.

I have studied Mr. Bress's record extensively, and I would like to run through some of what I have found.

Mr. Bress claims to spend a substantial amount of time working in his law firm's San Francisco office. However, as recently as November 2018, Mr. Bress's profile on the Kirkland & Ellis LLP website listed him as an attorney working exclusively in the firm's Washington, DC, office. His profile page likewise provided contact information—phone and fax—only for the Washington, DC, office.

Just before he was nominated, Mr. Bress's Kirkland & Ellis profile was revised to list him as an attorney in both the Washington, DC, and San Francisco, CA, offices of the firm.

In addition, according to a review conducted by my staff, every public legal filing signed by Mr. Bress lists his office as Washington, DC. This includes legal filings submitted in California courts. Mr. Bress has never had an oral argument before the Ninth Circuit—never had an oral argument before the Ninth Circuit.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee entered a letter into the record at Mr. Bress's hearing identifying 26 cases in California courts that Mr. Bress has been involved in. However, according to Mr. Bress's Senate Judiciary questionnaire, 11 of these 26 cases were asbestos lawsuits for a single client, the chemical company BASF Catalyst. Another four cases were products liability lawsuits involving another single client, the air conditioning manufacturer United Technologies Corporation. So those are two clients. This is hardly the wide breadth of California court experience that one would expect of a Ninth Circuit court appointee.

Mr. Bress does not belong to any legal organizations in California. His children do not attend school in our State. He has voted only once since high school in a California election. And he does not have a California driver's license. Finally, Mr. Bress does not own any property in California outside of one share in a family business venture.

These facts, along with Mr. Bress's residency in the Washington, DC, area—he lives here; his family lives here—make clear to us that he is not a Californian, nor is he suited for the Ninth Circuit.

This is something we have never experienced before; that is, bringing a judge from one coast to put him on the Ninth Circuit on the other coast.

Some of my Republican colleagues have cited past instances when an attorney living and practicing in one State has been nominated and confirmed to a seat in another State. This is highly unusual.

Republicans have been able to provide examples of this occurring only 4 times in the past 20 years, and in each case, it was with the support of the home State Senators. This support is simply not here in this case; this is not the case with this nominee.

California is a diverse and complex State. We have over 40 million people. It is the fifth largest economy in the world. It makes up 14 percent of the U.S. economy. There are 53 Fortune 500 companies that are based in our State. We have the largest ag industry in the country. We produce more manufacturing revenue than any other State. And California technology companies produce 53 percent of all tech revenues in the United States.

This vast and diverse nature of California's people and economy means the Ninth Circuit regularly considers challenging and complex issues of fact and law. These cases require not only the sharpest legal minds but lawyers and judges who know and understand the complexities facing the State of California.

We have an imported judge now coming to the Ninth Circuit. One of our most critical tasks as Senators is to ensure that lifetime appointments to the Federal courts are well qualified and well suited to the seats to which they have been nominated.

Home State Senators are a crucial part of this evaluation process. The Presiding Officer knows this very well. I am so disappointed that the majority has disregarded this.

This disregard of blue slips represents another breakdown of Senate traditions. It is really very disturbing. One thing I have learned over 20 years here is that what goes around comes around. By doing this, it is a major violation of a precedent that this Senate has followed, I believe, to its absolute.

I will vote against Mr. Bress's confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

REMEMBERING JIM TARICANI

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today to salute a hometown hero, a dedicated journalist, and a trusted newsmen, Jim Taricani, who sadly passed away last month after decades of contributions to Rhode Island and the field of journalism throughout this country.

This is just an example of the tributes that he won by a very, very enthusiastic population of Rhode Island. This is the front page of the Providence Journal on the day of his funeral service.

He was a gentleman. He was a man of integrity, a man of fairness—the quali-

ties that define a great journalist. In fact, the words "great journalist" and "Jim Taricani" are synonymous.

He leaves behind an extraordinary legacy. He was an award-winning investigative journalist who earned multiple Emmys and the coveted Edward R. Murrow Award, and he was a true champion of the First Amendment.

Jim grew up in Connecticut and served the U.S. Air Force, where he was stationed in Europe as a military police officer. But he made his mark when he moved to Rhode Island and embarked on a career in broadcast journalism, first in radio, and then over a 30-year career at WJAR that spanned from the late 1970s through 2014.

Jim began his stint for NBC 10—WJAR—as a general assignment reporter but gained notoriety for covering big stories and uncovering the truth. He went on to found the station's investigative team in 1979.

He earned a reputation for taking on tough stories about organized crime and political corruption. In reporting on these difficult topics, Jim's own integrity, selflessness, and fairness shone through every day and every moment.

Indeed, Jim didn't just talk about principles; he lived them. In February 2001, Jim obtained an FBI surveillance video from a confidential source. It showed a public employee accepting a bribe in the famed Operation Plunder Dome case, which transfixed Rhode Island and Providence, its capital, for many, many months. It marked a significant moment when people could see and hear what corruption looked like. Rather than following a court order to reveal the source of the tape, Jim stood up for the First Amendment, and he was sentenced to 6 months of home confinement.

Several of Jim's friends and colleagues wrote letters to the judge on Jim's behalf, including Christiane Amanpour, who interned for Jim in the early 1980s, when she was a student at URI.

She noted that Jim Taricani taught her "that journalism when done right is a noble profession, that America's unique commitment to freedom of the press is vital to a functioning democracy, [and] that holding public officials to account is the imperative of a corruption-free society."

Indeed, that is what Jim set out to do through his reporting.

He became a strong advocate for other journalists, testifying before Congress about freedom of the press and the challenges journalists face in trying to keep the public informed about their government. His help, his actions, and his activity spurred action. The Senate Judiciary Committee advanced Senator SCHUMER's bipartisan media shield bill. But the work to protect journalists, and to ensure that they can responsibly do their job and inform the public, continues. We must find a bipartisan way forward that balances freedom of the press and public safety.

Jim was also a tremendous advocate for the American Heart Association. A survivor of cardiovascular disease and multiple heart attacks, Jim documented his own process of undergoing a heart transplant, from uncertainty to recovery. Here is how the Providence Journal's television critic described it:

Listed—the title refers to the word from doctors that every heart transplant candidate longs to hear—is the most powerful human interest story I have ever seen on local television. It is courageous first-person journalism, a story that you may never forget.

Taricani, who kept a diary throughout his hospital stay, wanted to have his experience videotaped in order to produce a donor awareness video for the American Heart Association. It was never his intention to broadcast the account, but when the news director, Dan Salamone, suggested it would reach a broader audience if televised, Taricani agreed.

That was Jim. He was not looking to be the story but was willing to share his story if it could help others. Thoughtful, tenacious, and tough—that was Jim Taricani. By the way, 32 days after receiving his new heart, Jim was back at work, which tells you everything you need to know about how passionate he was about journalism and how much he loved his job.

Undoubtedly, the love of his life was his wife, Laurie White, who is a force in her own right and has taken up Jim's cause of freedom of the press and encouraging the next generation of aspiring young journalists to go out and make a difference. She has endowed a lecture series on First Amendment rights at the University of Rhode Island in Jim's honor, which is a fitting tribute.

She said:

Journalists bring sunlight to the stories that otherwise may stay hidden in the shadows. It is my hope that this lecture series will continue his legacy of inspiring the next generation of ethical and responsible journalists.

I expect the series will help increase public understanding of the importance of a free press and the First Amendment for decades to come.

As a journalist and as a person, nothing stopped Jim from following the facts, uncovering the truth, sharing important stories, and enlightening his audience. We are all, in Rhode Island and across the country, deeply saddened by the loss of Jim Taricani, but his example and legacy endure. That legacy will sustain us and inspire us to continue working together to build a just and decent country, and for that we are all grateful to Jim.

Madam President, I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, it is a great honor to join my senior colleague, Senator REED, on the Senate floor to remember someone we both knew very well, Jim Taricani, a