

They don't let our top-notch companies in or let them in under such restraints that many of them don't want to come in or can't operate effectively or have to surrender their family jewels, their intellectual property, to Chinese companies.

If that is the case, and it is, why do we just let any Chinese company come in here, particularly when they might be a real national security risk? China's telecom companies have 10 "points of presence" in North American networks. Do you know how many American companies have the same in China? Zero. China Telecom gets access to our networks, but T-Mobile or any other American telecom company can't operate in China. Enough of that. Enough of that. Enough of China trying to take advantage of us. We sort of sit there and do not do anything to protect our workers, our wealth, and the great kinds of ideas Americans come up with in terms of intellectual property.

This isn't just a question of fairness. It is a question of which nation will lead the world in these industries in the coming decades, creating jobs and wealth. I want America to lead. Our businesses need to be able to compete equally and fairly. I am confident, if there were a level playing field, America would prevail, and we would stay the leading economy in the world. If we continue to let China take advantage of us while we sit there with our hands folded, woe is us—and particularly for our children and our grandchildren.

I conclude by reminding the Trump administration that in the ongoing trade negotiations with Beijing, where the President has been tougher on China than either of the previous two administrations—and that is a good thing—the topic of reciprocity and fair market access should be front and center, and we shouldn't give in until we are treated fairly.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last year, we on the Judiciary Committee conducted an incredibly thorough review of a nominee to the Supreme Court of the United States. We dug into Justice Kavanaugh's personal and professional life and discussed concerns openly in front of the public.

Allegations were raised against the Justice, but none could be corroborated or verified. I know about this because I

had a team of dozens of lawyers and investigators chasing down each allegation we received. My team spoke to 45 individuals and took 25 written statements.

Anyone can review the 415-page investigation summary report that I released last November. We laid out the information we received, including some of the ugliest of claims. In the end, there was no credible evidence to support any of the allegations. Brett Kavanaugh then was duly confirmed to the Supreme Court by this body, as prescribed in the Constitution.

Now, fast forward to this past weekend, and the issues that I and a lot of other Members of the Senate are being asked about this very day, just as if there is nothing else going on in this town, but you dig up something that happened a year ago.

The New York Times published a book excerpt about Justice Kavanaugh's younger days that has fueled a very fresh rumor from someone whose friends claim contacted Senators on the committee. That person, Mr. Stier, didn't reach out or provide information to the committee's majority. Apparently, he also didn't provide any information to these writers. It is only on the word of two anonymous sources that his name and accusation come up in this story in the New York Times.

Again, my office never received anything from Mr. Stier or his unnamed friends, and we never received an allegation against Kavanaugh like the one referenced in the report over this weekend. After interviewing eight people related to the Ramirez allegations, not once was Mr. Stier's name mentioned. Had my staff received substantive allegations or had he approached me or my staff, we would have attempted to take a statement and interview him. But the alleged victim, who also didn't speak to these writers, apparently, does not recall the incident. That is a point that the New York Times failed to include in its initial coverage.

Now, it happens that accountability is a cornerstone of democracy. I welcome scrutiny of my work. I frequently refer to reporters and journalists as the police of our democratic system, but today I am reminded of a very old adage: Who will watch the watchmen? This weekend's report included some embarrassing and irresponsible missteps. They are mistakes that warrant serious self-reflection.

A year ago, after the interviews with dozens of people, the New York Times couldn't even corroborate the allegations laid out by Ms. Ramirez and declined to report on them. With nothing but a year of time and another interview with Ramirez herself, the paper thought those unverified claims were suddenly worth printing—no more corroboration and no more verification. Coming only days before the release of the author's book, I can't help but wonder if the timing had something to do with the decision to run the story. Maybe it was to sell more books.

They also laid out what commentators are now calling a new allegation. Let me be clear. This is not an allegation. It is barely a third-hand rumor. These writers—can you believe this?—didn't even speak to the man who they claim originally recounted this rumor. What is left are only layers and layers of decades-old hearsay—no more corroboration, no more verification, and not even anything from the accuser himself, and, most importantly, nothing from the person who was allegedly involved.

Now, the most shameful piece of this episode is that it took more than a full day, after publication, for the editors to intervene and to provide critical context. An editor's note added to the story last night reads: "The book reports that the female student declined to be interviewed and friends say that she does not recall the incident."

Let me quote again: "... she does not recall the incident." That is the alleged victim. That is the opposite of corroboration and verification. In the legal world, this sort of thing is called exculpatory information. When it is not laid bare to provide greater context, it creates a serious credibility problem.

In this case, the New York Times withheld crucial facts that undercut its own reporting. We now have an uncorroborated accusation, rooted only in unnamed sources, with no direct knowledge of the event and that the alleged victim doesn't even remember.

Now, you know about the New York Times. Their slogan is that they only print what is "fit to print." I just described this situation of no corroboration rooted in an unnamed source without direct knowledge of this event and that the alleged victim doesn't even remember.

Now, to get back to the slogan of the newspaper, when did this stuff I described become something "fit to print" by the supposed American paper of record?

The sad consequences of this article are a misinformed public, a greater divide in our own discourse, and a deeper lack of faith in our news media.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 legislative clerk read the nomination of John Rakolta, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Emirates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

UNITED AUTO WORKERS STRIKE

Mr. BROWN. Today I hope my colleagues will join me in standing in solidarity with thousands of UAW workers in Ohio and around the country. Workers are going without their paychecks today because they are demanding General Motors respect the work they do which has made this company so successful.

All workers have the right to stand up for fair pay and benefits, for better working conditions, and for a voice in their company. Let's be clear. The autoworkers, shall we say, are the engine behind GM's success. GM wouldn't be making a dime of profit without the workers who actually make their cars and trucks. Autoworkers stood up and made sacrifices to help GM when times were tough.

The Presiding Officer was a Member of the House then, and I was a Member of the Senate. We saw what happened during the rescue of the auto industry and how much those workers gave up to save this industry. We remember the depths of the recession. We remember when President Obama took office as 800,000 were losing their jobs the first month and 700,000 the second month until, with the auto rescue, House Democrats, with President Obama, turned this economy around. We have seen, literally, economic growth each quarter over the last 10 years. This was, in large part, because so many workers, like the UAW workers, were willing to give up something at the bargaining table.

In some cases, clearly, some people in this town wanted to abandon that company. Now that times are better, all the workers are asking for is their fair share. So far, GM has not treated these workers as the critical partners they are in our auto industry.

Look at what GM has done in my State. Look at what they did in Lordstown, OH. The company shut down its most productive plant in North America, by GM's own measurements. The Lordstown plant near Youngstown, OH, as recently as 2½ years ago—back during the Obama administration—had 4,500 workers working there. Even though President Trump said: Don't sell your homes; these jobs are coming back, they have been laid off—hundreds of workers, 4,500 over the last couple years. At the same time, GM announced they were going to build the Chevy Blazer in Mexico.

GM could retool that Lordstown plant, and they could build the Blazer

in Ohio. They could put some of their electric vehicles in the Lordstown plant in Ohio. We know they have plenty of money to work with. They earned higher than expected profits in the first quarter of this year. President Trump's tax cuts for the rich gave huge amounts of tax breaks to General Motors. Much of the money went to General Motors' executives. All these workers are asking for is to share in those profits, have a voice in their company.

GM made the decision to close Lordstown and other plants around the country with no input from the workers who earned those profits for that company. Now workers are standing up and fighting for increased investments in their local communities.

I spoke this week with Gary Jones, the international president of the United Auto Workers, about Lordstown and bringing these jobs back. That is what they are trying to win at the bargaining table.

We know strikes are always a last resort for workers. My wife grew up in Ashtabula, OH. Her dad carried a union card, Utility Workers of America. He did maintenance for that plant for more than 30 years. Twice when she was growing up they went on strike. She knows, as workers know, they never get back what they lose in a strike. So when they strike, it is when their backs are against the wall. The wife of one GM worker posted online this week: "I can only pray this strike is short."

These workers want to do their jobs. They want to work. They don't want to be on the picket line. They want to reach a solution that honors their work.

GM needs to agree to a contract that honors the dignity of work and recognizes autoworkers, the communities, and the families who are affected by this and who helped drive the success of the auto industry in Ohio and across the country.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, once again, the Trump administration is trying to take healthcare away from people.

I will never forget. I was sitting at this desk on the Senate floor the night when Senators MURKOWSKI, COLLINS, and McCain voted against repealing the Affordable Care Act. I watched my colleagues—all of whom have good health insurance—all of us have good health insurance because of taxpayers. I watched my colleagues, one after another after another, vote to take health insurance away from millions of people. There are 900,000 people in my State alone who have insurance now because of the Affordable Care Act.

This time, the Trump administration is trying to pull funding from health facilities that tell the truth to their patients—facilities like Planned Parenthood—that nearly 100,000 Ohioans rely on. They are blocking title X funding for any healthcare organization that actually gives patients medically

relevant information and the full range of healthcare options. We know who makes these decisions. I hate to say it this way, but it is mostly White men in Washington, and they have very serious consequences for Ohio women.

This month, two Planned Parenthood clinics in Cincinnati announced they will have to close their doors. This will be devastating for so many Southwest Ohio women. It will mean they have fewer options for healthcare services they need, including preventive care like cancer screenings and STI testing and birth control. It will mean many women won't be able to see the doctors they rely on and trust.

A student in Cincinnati named Caroline—who said we can use her first name—talked to a local reporter about what this decision means for her. She said:

I have a very close relationship with my provider. There's a lot of trust there that's been built over the years.

But now, because of this President, she is not going to be able to see that doctor anymore—to what purpose other than playing politics?

I got a letter from another woman in Cincinnati, who wrote:

As someone who lost her grandmother to uterine cancer in March, I know how important it is for women to have access to the healthcare services that Planned Parenthood provides. Women have the right to make informed decisions about their own bodies and to have access to examinations that can help save their lives.

That came from a woman in Cincinnati.

We know Planned Parenthood provides these exams and tests. These clinics are often the only places that many women and some men have to turn. They either can't afford somewhere else, or they live too far away from other healthcare providers to have any other real option. Last year, the West Side clinic that is closing in Cincinnati performed more than 6,900 STI tests. The Springdale clinic that is closing performed more than 6,300 tests.

Another woman from Cincinnati wrote to say that her 30-year-old daughter has an advanced degree, but her income is "below poverty level," and she relies on Planned Parenthood for her care. Does this mean she won't get care? It probably does. It means she can't afford to go anywhere else. She will just go without care, and we know what can then happen to someone. The mother of the 30-year-old daughter said: "Now she will be hard-pressed to find a provider that will take her for checkups, to receive birth control and more."

The assault on women's healthcare isn't just coming from the Trump administration; they are encouraging rightwing State legislatures all over the country. Over the past few years, we have seen State legislatures notably—including my State, unfortunately, Ohio—making it harder and harder for clinics to operate and provide those preventive services. They