

liability of high-level Saudi officials, especially the Crown Prince.

Third, once Turkey publicly announced Mr. Khashoggi's murder, the Saudi Government used consular immunity to obstruct Turkey's investigation until the crime scene could be cleaned, and there are reasons to conclude that the destruction of evidence could not have taken place without the Crown Prince's knowledge.

Fourth, Saudi officials falsely denied knowledge of Mr. Khashoggi's murder for more than 2 weeks, and they continue to deny state responsibility.

Fifth, the trial of the suspects who have been charged in Saudi Arabia will not deliver justice or the whole truth.

Sixth, Jamal Khashoggi's remains have yet to be located and turned over to his family.

Some have ignored the findings in the report, as the lobbyists who continue to rake in millions of dollars from the Saudi Government have encouraged, and as the Trump administration appears inclined to do. But ignoring the facts doesn't change what happened. And it bears repeating: The fact is, a journalist was murdered by the Saudi Government in a manner that implicates officials at the highest level in the royal family. The fact is, the Saudi Government engaged in a flagrant coverup and continues to deny any responsibility. The fact is, the steps being taken to pursue justice are a sham.

After the report was released, the Saudi Foreign Minister dismissed its finding as not containing any new information—as if the murder, coverup, and lack of accountability are irrelevant because they have been previously reported.

While many of the summary findings in the report may not be new, they are supported by roughly 100 pages of detailed information in which the Special Rapporteur and her team document official reports from the U.S., Saudi, and Turkish Governments, they include quotes from interviews conducted around the world, and they share excerpts of the gruesome intelligence information to which they had access.

Ms. Callamard presented the facts, her own conclusions, and the methodology used to reach those conclusions, and she was clear about where there were limitations of her inquiry. The report shows a meticulous and objective effort to find the truth. For that reason, it stands in stark contrast to the approach taken by both the Saudi Government and the Trump administration.

The Special Rapporteur also made several recommendations, including some that are directed specifically to the United States. They include the following:

Open an FBI investigation into the murder of Mr. Khashoggi, and pursue criminal prosecutions within the United States as appropriate.

Make a determination under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Ac-

countability Act regarding the responsibility of the Crown Prince, the de facto ruler of Saudi Arabia.

To the greatest extent possible, consistent with national security, declassify materials relating to the murder of Mr. Khashoggi.

And hold congressional hearings on the responsibility of top Saudi officials and demand access to the relevant classified materials.

After Ms. Callamard's report was released, President Trump, just like the Saudi Foreign Minister, dismissed its findings. He made clear he intends to take no action in response to the report.

In addition, despite Secretary Pompeo's repeated claim that the administration is "committed to holding each individual accountable" in the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, the facts indicate the opposite. The administration continues to refuse to adhere to its legal requirements—refuses to follow the law—under the Magnitsky Act to determine liability in the murder, including the liability of the Crown Prince.

In fact, President Trump has made no effort to conceal that the administration's complicity in protecting the Saudi royal family is linked to billions of dollars in sales of U.S. weapons to the Saudi Government. During an interview shortly after the report was released, the President admitted to not raising the U.N. report with the Crown Prince, and said: "Saudi Arabia's a big buyer of American products; that means something to me."

Asked whether Saudi Arabia paid the right price for the United States "to look the other way," President Trump said: "No, no. But I'm not like a fool that says, 'We don't want to do business with them . . . Take their money.'"

I was a prosecutor for 8 years. The fact that premeditated murder is being condoned because of billions of dollars in Saudi money is unconscionable.

According to President Trump, our relations with Saudi Arabia should not change regardless of the outcome of any investigation. Think about that. The President is saying that no matter what the evidence shows, no matter how compelling the evidence implicating the Crown Prince in murder and obstruction of justice, that should not affect our relations with the Saudi Government. That is a shocking statement.

Instead, the administration has limited its response to imposing sanctions only against individuals who reportedly carried out the murder, as well as a few other officials believed to have played a role in ordering or facilitating the operation, and has argued that, by doing so, it has fulfilled its commitment to pursuing justice.

It is the same as what the Saudi Government has done—claim to be holding the hit men accountable while absolving the Saudi leadership and royal family of any responsibility.

Yet the Special Rapporteur has rightly emphasized that the pursuit of justice for Jamal Khashoggi and his family is about finding the truth.

Secretary Pompeo recently spoke about the need to ensure that our principles guide our policy. That is a view I share, but I have to wonder what he meant by that pious statement. What principles was he talking about? There is no evidence that the administration is being guided by principle in the Khashoggi case. To the contrary, there is every reason to believe this administration has made a calculated decision to do the opposite. In fact, the President has said as much.

There should be nothing controversial about holding accountable a government that systemically represses and abuses its own people, that is currently arbitrarily detaining American citizens whom it has also reportedly tortured, that has repeatedly committed war crimes in Yemen that potentially implicate the United States, and that is responsible for the premeditated murder of a widely respected journalist.

I hope other Senators will join me in calling on the Trump administration to lead the international community by example. Our government should put Special Rapporteur Callamard's recommendations into practice, and we should urge other governments to do the same.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Dakota.

**Mr. THUNE.** Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks before the vote.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

**TRADE**

**Mr. THUNE.** Madam President, a number of my colleagues were here just a few moments ago talking about trade and the impact of trade on agriculture. I have been down here a lot on the floor to talk about the ag economy in recent weeks. If you look at our economy as a whole, it is thriving, but our Nation's farmers and ranchers are still having a tough time, thanks to years of commodity and livestock prices that are below production cost because of protracted trade disputes and now, on top of that, natural disasters.

One of the most important things we can do to help our agricultural economy is to negotiate favorable trade agreements for U.S. producers. Our Nation's farmers and ranchers depend on trade. In my home State of South Dakota, we export a substantial portion of the agricultural products we produce.

Right now, though, farmers and ranchers are facing a lot of uncertainty when it comes to trade. There are a number of outstanding trade agreements, and farmers and ranchers are unsure what the rules of the road are going to look like in the future. That is why I have urged the administration to

wrap up negotiations on the various trade deals under consideration as swiftly as possible.

I strongly support the administration's goal of strengthening market access for our Nation's farmers and ranchers, and we have made real progress in negotiations. Now it is time to push for a conclusion to these deals and give our Nation's agricultural producers certainty about what international markets are going to look like.

There is one deal, however, that we don't need to wait for; that is, the United States-Mexico-Canada Free Trade Agreement. Negotiations on this trade agreement are finished. Mexico has already passed the agreement, and Canada is just waiting for the United States to act. All we need is for Speaker PELOSI to indicate her willingness to take up this deal, and the President will formally submit the agreement to Congress for approval.

The United States-Mexico-Canada Free Trade Agreement is a big win for our Nation's farmers and ranchers. Canada and Mexico are the No. 1 and No. 2 export markets for American food and agricultural products. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve and expand farmers' access to these critical markets and give farmers certainty about what these markets will look like long term.

I am particularly pleased with the improvements the agreement makes for U.S. dairy producers. Dairy is an important and rapidly growing industry in South Dakota. Drive the I-29 corridor north of Brookings, and you can see firsthand what massive dairy expansion we have experienced in South Dakota over the past few years.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve U.S. dairy farmers' role as a key dairy supplier to Mexico, and it will substantially expand market access in Canada, where U.S. dairy sales have been restricted.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than \$277 million. The agreement will also expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers. It will make it easier for U.S. producers to export wheat to Canada.

I have spent my time today talking about the agricultural industry, but, of course, this agreement goes much further. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will benefit virtually every sector of our economy, from manufacturing to digital services to the automotive industry. It will create 176,000 new jobs, grow our economy, and raise wages for workers.

It is time to pass this agreement and to realize its economic benefits. Senate Republicans are ready; we are ready to approve this agreement once the White House submits it to Congress. We are just waiting for Democratic leaders in the House to indicate their willingness to take up the deal. It is time for them to do so.

Democrats' concerns have been more than addressed throughout the negotiation process. The final trade agreement is perhaps the most worker-friendly trade agreement the United States has ever considered. It is a big improvement on the North American Free Trade Agreement—the agreement under which we are currently operating—on the issues over which Democrats have expressed concern.

If they are serious about making progress on these issues and are not just trying to sink the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement with specious objections, Democrats should give the President the go-ahead and take up and pass this agreement in the near future.

NOTIFICATION OF PETER JOSEPH PHIPPS

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Judge Peter Phipps of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Judge Phipps is highly qualified to serve on the Third Circuit. He has dedicated his legal career to public service, first as a decorated career attorney at the U.S. Department of Justice and now as a Federal trial judge. As both a judge and a lawyer, he has been a faithful adherent to the rule of law.

Senator CASEY and I supported Judge Phipps' nomination to the district court. He was recommended to us by the bipartisan judicial advisory panel that we use to vet and recommend candidates to fill district court vacancies in the Western District of Pennsylvania. In 2018, the Senate easily confirmed Judge Phipps to the district court by voice vote after the Senate Judiciary Committee reported him to the floor by voice vote.

Before joining the bench, Judge Phipps served for 15 years as a career attorney in the U.S. Department of Justice's Civil Division, where he worked under three Presidential administrations of both parties. He represented the Federal Government in numerous complex cases and received multiple awards for his excellent work. Since 2014, he has served as an adjunct law professor at Duquesne University, where he teaches administrative law. Earlier in his career, he clerked for Chief Judge Guy Cole on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and worked as a commercial litigator in private practice. Judge Phipps is a graduate of the University of Dayton and Stanford Law School.

Judge Phipps has an outstanding reputation for intelligence, professionalism, fairness, and integrity, but you do not have to take my word for it. Here are few examples of how others have described him.

The American Bar Association has rated him well-qualified on the basis of his integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament. Minority Leader SCHUMER and Senator LEAHY, the former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, have called the American Bar Association's rating

“the gold standard by which judicial candidates are judged.”

Senator GRAHAM, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, stated after Judge Phipps' nomination hearing on June 5, 2019 that Judge Phipps “is one of the most impressive nominees for the U.S. Circuit Courts that has appeared before the Committee. He is incredibly smart and well balanced. Mr. Phipps will be a great addition to the Third Circuit.”

At Judge Phipps' district court investiture on December 18, 2018, Chief Judge Cole of the Sixth Circuit, an appointee of President Bill Clinton, said that Judge Phipps “has earned a reputation for honesty, trustworthiness, great character, humility and professionalism.” In addition, Chief Judge Cole stated that Judge Phipps “has a brilliant mind, endless curiosity, and an even temperament. He will treat all who come before him equally and apply a strong work ethic to each and every matter. In short, Judge Phipps will be fair and just in the truest sense of those words.”

Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama, has written to the Senate in support of Judge Phipps' nomination. He worked closely with Judge Phipps on a legal matter when he was Secretary of Defense. His letter states: “Throughout the many hours we spent with one another I was repeatedly impressed by Peter's legal acumen, dedication, attention to detail, and integrity. I have come to know Peter to be a faithful public servant and an excellent attorney. I am very pleased that he has been nominated to give his time and talents to the bench. I believe Peter will serve with honor and highly recommend his confirmation.”

The Senate has also received enthusiastic letters of support for Judge Phipps' nomination from attorneys who have litigated with and against him, including former colleagues from the U.S. Department of Justice. For instance, one group of attorneys praised Judge Phipps as a “model jurist” who has a “piercing intellect” and “deep knowledge of the law.” Similarly, a group of his former colleagues from the U.S. Department of Justice wrote: “Judge Phipps' generosity, perspective, commitment to the rule of law, and selflessness—in addition to his intelligence and extensive experience—will make him a superb appellate judge.”

I am confident that Judge Phipps will live up to this high praise on the Third Circuit. He has all the essential qualities needed to excel as a Federal appellate judge: experience, intelligence, integrity, and respect for the limited role of the judiciary in our constitutional system. I am pleased to support this highly qualified nominee and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Phipps nomination?

Mr. MORAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Ex.]

#### YEAS—56

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

#### NAYS—40

Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden
Hassan	Rosen	
Heinrich	Sanders	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Bennet	Gillibrand
Booker	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.

#### 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 senior assistant legislative 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 Treaties Calendar No. 1, Treaty Document No. 113-4, the Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Johnny Isakson, Kevin Cramer, John Boozman, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

#### YEAS—94

Alexander	Graham	Reed
Baldwin	Grassley	Risch
Barrasso	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	McSally	Udall
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	
Gardner	Portman	

#### NAYS—1

Paul

#### NOT VOTING—5

Bennet	Gillibrand	Sanders
Booker	Harris	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 1.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### THE PROTOCOL AMENDING THE TAX CONVENTION WITH SPAIN

The clerk will state the treaty.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty Document No. 113-4, The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 910, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell Amendment No. 911 (to Amendment No. 910) to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 910 be withdrawn and the only amendments in order to Treaties Calendar No. 1 be the Paul amendment Nos. 924 to the treaty and 921 to the resolution of ratification; further, that at 5 p.m. today, the Senate vote on the Paul amendment No. 924; that following disposition of that amendment, the resolution of ratification be reported and the Senate vote on Paul amendment No. 921 take place; that following disposition of that amendment, the Senate vote on the resolution of ratification with no intervening action or debate; that if the resolution of ratification is agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that the only amendments in order to treaties Calendar Nos. 2, 3, and 4 be the Paul amendment Nos. 922, 919, 923, 918, and 920; finally, that the cloture motions in relation to treaties Calendar Nos. 2, 3, and 4 be withdrawn, the pending amendments to the treaties be withdrawn, and the Senate vote on ratification of the treaties at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader on Wednesday, July 17.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions with respect to the Corker, Blanchard, and Tapia nominations ripen following disposition of Treaties Calendar No. 4.

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

(Mrs. BLACKBURN assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Under the previous order, the pending amendments are withdrawn.

The Senator from Kentucky.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 924

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 924.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 924 to Treaty Document No. 113-4.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Protocol to protect tax privacy)

In paragraph 1 of Article 27 of the Convention, as amended by Article XIII of the Protocol, strike "such information as is