

(6) emphasizes that until a transition to a credible civilian-led government that reflects the aspirations of the Sudanese people is established, the process to consider removing Sudan from the State Sponsor of Terrorism List, lifting any other remaining sanctions on Sudan, or normalizing relations with the Government of Sudan will continue to be suspended; and

(7) stands in solidarity with the people of Sudan and their aspirations for a democratic, participatory government.

#### CHRISTA MCAULIFFE COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT OF 2019

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 239 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 239) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THUNE. I further ask unanimous consent that the Shaheen amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 907) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 4, line 13, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

On page 5, line 6, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

On page 5, line 7, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. THUNE. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill, as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 239

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Christa McAuliffe Commemorative Coin Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Christa McAuliffe was a social studies teacher at Concord High School in Concord, New Hampshire.

(2) In 1985, Christa McAuliffe was selected to be the first participant in the Teacher in Space program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(3) On January 28, 1986, Christa McAuliffe and 6 other astronauts were tragically killed during the Space Shuttle Challenger disaster.

(4) In 1989, For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology (in this Act referred to as “FIRST”) was founded to inspire young people’s interest and participation in science and technology.

(5) The mission of FIRST “is to inspire young people to be science and technology leaders, by engaging them in exciting mentor-based programs that build science, engineering, and technology skills, that inspire innovation, and that foster well-rounded life capabilities including self-confidence, communication, and leadership”.

(6) 2019 marks the 30th anniversary of the founding of FIRST.

(7) Each year, more than 1,000,000 children from the United States and more than 86 countries participate in a FIRST program.

(8) Studies have shown that alumni of FIRST programs are more likely to become scientists and engineers and to volunteer in their communities.

(9) FIRST is dedicated to carrying on the mission of Christa McAuliffe of inspiring students and creating a new generation of dreamers and innovators.

(10) 2016 marked the 30th anniversary of the Space Shuttle Challenger tragedy.

#### SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—In commemoration of Christa McAuliffe, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 \$1 coins, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (3) contain at least 90 percent silver.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

#### SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall bear—

- (A) an image of and the name of Christa McAuliffe on the obverse side; and
- (B) a design on the reverse side that depicts the legacy of Christa McAuliffe as a teacher.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

- (A) a designation of the value of the coin;
- (B) an inscription of the year “2021”; and
- (C) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

- (1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the family of Christa McAuliffe, FIRST, and the Commission of Fine Arts; and
- (2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

#### SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2021, and ending on December 31, 2021.

#### SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

- (1) the face value of the coins;
- (2) the surcharge provided under section 7(a) with respect to the coins; and
- (3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins, including—
  - (A) labor;
  - (B) materials;
  - (C) dies;
  - (D) use of machinery;
  - (E) overhead expenses;
  - (F) marketing; and
  - (G) shipping.

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of the coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

#### SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of \$10 per coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, and section 8(2), all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the FIRST robotics program for the purpose of engaging and inspiring young people, through mentor-based programs, to become leaders in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

(c) AUDITS.—The FIRST robotics program shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with respect to the amounts received under subsection (b).

#### SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act result in no net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, are disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7(b) until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping, is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

Mr. THUNE. I further ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 2740 AND H.R. 3055

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related

agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Mr. THUNE. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2019

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 10; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Wetherell nomination.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator CASEY.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise this evening to talk about judicial nominations and, in my view, the state of play, where we are. I want to highlight some of the very real impacts these nominations have on Americans across the board.

We have had a number of opportunities this year to come together and have agreement on some judicial nominations, but, frankly, this year—the last several years—this issue has been the subject of conflict and sometimes rancor and division on the Senate floor and in the committee, the committee of jurisdiction, the Judiciary Committee.

I have raised concerns about the willingness of Senate Republicans to dismantle longstanding Senate rules but also Senate norms, all in a rush to pack the bench with nominees who are often both ideological and also, in some cases—not in all but in some cases—both too ideological and often unqualified.

Early this afternoon, the Senate voted to confirm Daniel Aaron Bress to a Ninth Circuit seat in California. I

will talk about his nomination just by way of example, not by way of argument before a confirmation vote because that has passed.

I think his nomination and confirmation are another example of the decline of the Senate's once-proud traditions relating to judicial nominations.

He was opposed by both of his home State Senators. Both Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator HARRIS did not return a blue slip for Daniel Aaron Bress.

The blue slip, as many people know, is literally a single piece of paper where Senators sign their name and then check off whether they support or oppose, as a way to have consensus between Senators from their home State, and it has always been accorded respect and deference in this Chamber, but that has all changed now.

In this case, you had a California nomination—I will get to that part of it in a moment—where, as I said, both Senators did not return blue slips. In this case, in particular, I think it is particularly offensive because Senator FEINSTEIN is the ranking member of the committee.

For those who don't pay attention to all this terminology, "ranking member" is the top person in one party who is not the chairman or chairwoman, as the case may be.

So as the top Democrat, the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, her opposition to Judge Bress should be an important factor in his nomination and confirmation.

Prior to this administration, the Judiciary Committee had never held a hearing for a nominee from the ranking member's home State without his or her support. Again, that has all changed just recently.

Prior rules and norms have not stopped Republicans in the Senate from pushing extreme and sometimes corporate nominees through this process, especially at the circuit court level.

In a recent press release, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator HARRIS explained that they opposed Judge Bress in part because he had so few connections to California. He lived in California for only 1 year since graduating from high school, he has not voted in California in an election for over a decade, and the California bar lists him as a Washington, DC, attorney.

I mention that because that should be relevant. When a home State Senator—in this case, two home State Senators, one of whom is the top Democrat on the Judiciary Committee—I think in that case there should be deference paid to that kind of concern that is raised. After all, they both represent their State.

As I mentioned earlier, the blue slip process is predicated on the idea that home State Senators are more familiar than anyone else with their State's legal community. I think that goes without saying. They serve an important role in nominating individuals to serve and represent the State.

Judge Bress is an example of why the blue slip process is so important. He is not part of the California legal community. Despite objections of the Senators, he will now sit on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and decide cases for a State with over 39 million residents at last count.

Without blue slips, what would prevent a California judge from being nominated to a court in another State? What would happen if you had someone from a different State, who had very little ties to a State, be nominated and confirmed, for example, to serve in a State like Pennsylvania? It doesn't make a lot of sense to most people. It is a norm that should not be violated.

His nomination illustrates how the blue slip process has been eviscerated, especially for the circuit courts, which is something that I had some firsthand experience with. I did not return a blue slip on one nominee who was confirmed, and in the second case, there was a hearing scheduled over my objections by way of not returning a blue slip.

That experience that I had as a Senator whose blue slip and the deference that should be paid as part of that blue slip process—that circumstance in my case is at variance with my experience for district court judges.

Senator TOOMEY and I—my colleague from Pennsylvania—have worked together to jointly recommend experienced, consensus nominees for the Federal district courts in Pennsylvania. We have three districts—the Eastern District, the Middle District, and the Western District.

Unfortunately, this bipartisan district court process has become the exception, not the rule. It used to pertain here in the Senate, where every State had some kind of process by which nominees were presented for confirmation by their home State Senators, and the White House—the administration—in every case would pay deference to that.

That is exceedingly rare today. I am thankful we have maintained it so far in Pennsylvania with regard to the work Senator TOOMEY and I do together and our staffs do together to reach consensus. It doesn't always work, by the way, but usually no one hears about the ones who don't work out because we keep that to ourselves and move on to the next person and see if we can't reach consensus. I appreciate that. I think we are either at 19 or 20 judges confirmed since 2011, working together, and I hope we can maintain that so that at least—at least—the blue slip process can be respected for district court nominees.

I think people who elect us in our home States expect that. They expect us to work together and to try to reach consensus where we can. Sometimes it is not possible, but they do expect us to do that. If there is an expectation of consensus and bipartisan cooperation