

Unfortunately for America, many issues, whether it is gun safety or sensible immigration policy, are the victims of our inaction in the U.S. Senate. We can do better, and we should. Ultimately, the American people have the last word as to whether this Senate will act on issues like gun safety and immigration. The last word is your vote. In the next election, I hope more and more Americans will vote for a Senate that responds to the challenges of our day and doesn't avoid our responsibility under the Constitution.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, for the information of all of our colleagues, the next vote will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, cloture on the McGuire nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 176.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Cella, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 the nomination of Joseph Cella, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, John Boozman, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 367.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 the nomination of Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, John Boozman, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 292.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Fabian Black, of North Dakota, to be Deputy Commissioner of Social Security for a term expiring January 19, 2025. (Reappointment)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 the nomination of David Fabian Black, of North Dakota, to be Deputy Commissioner of Social Security for a term expiring January 19, 2025. (Reappointment)

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, John Boozman, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 1044

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1044 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the Lee amendment, No. 939, be agreed to, that the bill as amended be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I want to commend my good friend from the great State of Utah, Senator MIKE LEE, for his work on putting this bill together and pulling the people together to support this bill.

I support this bill. We have some language that needs to be clarified, and I still have some concerns about the impact this legislation would have on

some specific industries in not only my State but in the country. I want to work with Senator LEE in addressing these concerns and come to a resolution on this very quickly. I commit to working with him and his team to make sure we get to a resolution because we want the exact same thing, and this is totally consistent with what President Trump is trying to do in his long-term work to fix our broken immigration system.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I want to recognize my appreciation for the Senator from Georgia, who has expressed a good-faith, earnest desire to work with me on this legislation. I want very badly to get this passed. It needs to pass. I want to talk for a few minutes about the reasons this legislation needs to pass.

I believe this legislation, as amended, as I proposed to be enacted today with Lee amendment No. 939, is itself ready to be passed into law. In my opinion, there is no justifiable cause for delay. We will continue to work on it. I wish we could pass it today. It should be passed today because it is ready.

The bill we are talking about, of course, is the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. This is an important, bipartisan piece of legislation, one that I have been proud to sponsor, along with Senator HARRIS, who has been my Democratic partner on this issue.

The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act has been a priority of mine for many years, nearly the entire time I have been in the Senate. During that time, it has been the subject of strong debate and a lot of scrutiny on the Hill. Like most bills, its path to becoming law has not always been straight or clear and certainly not clear of obstacles. But with the passage of the companion bill in the House of Representatives by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 365 to 65, I believe that now is the moment we really can finally move forward with this small but critically important fix to our immigration system. We could do that. We would be in a position to do that today had an objection not been raised.

Notwithstanding that objection, I am going to continue to work in the coming days to make it a reality because this is a reform whose time has come, and I would like to take a moment to explain why it deserves support from my colleagues.

Again, we have to take into account that this passed the House of Representatives with a vote of 365 to 65. It is not easy to find something that can garner that much bipartisan support.

Wrangling over the nuts and bolts and fine-print details of the policy, as extremely as important as that is, can at times allow us to lose sight of more basic foundational principles that should shape any law or any set of laws we put on the books.

Among other things, our laws should be consistent with our Nation's deeply held beliefs and values. A system of laws should also be clear and coherent, meaning that it should not only give adequate notice of what is required in order for a person to comply with the law, but it also should be something that is capable of being complied with. Finally, the means employed by any law should be consistent with the objectives that law seeks to accomplish. These are not partisan principles. They are simple yet incredibly important guideposts that should direct the actions of anyone entrusted with crafting a legal system, as we certainly are in this Chamber.

Unfortunately, the laws we pass don't always live up to the standards of fair and effective and consistent lawmaking. One of the starkest examples of our failure to abide by these same principles involves the way we allocate employment-based green cards.

Few ideas are more central to who we are as Americans than the notion that people should be judged and treated by their government based on their own merits as individuals—as individuals with inherent God-given rights—and not on the basis of the color of their skin or of the country in which they were born.

Our Founders wrote: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." Those words are as much a part of our national creed in this moment as they were when they were written some 243 years ago. Our laws should reflect this. They should reflect the enduring truth found in those words, which I believe were inspired. They are inspirational to this day. I believe they were inspired at the time they wrote them, and that is why they are lasting in their importance and their persuasive effect.

Despite this ideal, section 1152 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that "the total number of [employment-based] visas made available to natives of any single foreign state . . . in any fiscal year may not exceed 7 percent . . . of the total number of such visas made available." That rather antiseptic language, technical and clinical on its face, is, on closer inspection, deeply out of step with our country's commitment to nondiscrimination and to equal treatment under the law.

In practice, section 1152's 7 percent cap on immigrants from any one country means that, if two immigrants apply for an employment-based visa at precisely the same moment and have the exact same skills and education and other factors taken into account on their applications, one of them may wait 12 months for a green card while his counterpart languishes in the green card backlog for decades. That is not an exaggeration—literally decades.

The only factor that accounts for this gross and unfair, difficult to justify or defend disparity in treatment is the fact that the second immigrant in

my hypothetical example happened to have been born in a different country than the first. They are otherwise identically situated to each other, but one may be processed within a year, and the other may languish for decades. This is because, under the per-country cap system, immigrants from larger, more populated countries are only eligible to receive the same number of green cards annually as immigrants from smaller countries. As a result, the wait times for immigrants from larger countries have grown and grown decade after decade, with no end in sight. This amounts to a de facto country-of-origin discrimination, plain and simple, and no amount of legalese or wonkish policy arguments can cover up that fact.

Beyond its incompatibility with the deep and abiding principles upon which this country was founded, the per-country cap system violates another one of those commonsense maxims of good lawmaking that I mentioned earlier: the need for clarity and for consistency in the law.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act provides that it is unlawful for an employer "to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin." Yet the conditions created by the per-country caps virtually guarantee that employers on some level must take into account the national origin when recruiting certain immigrant workers.

If prospective hires from one country will be able to obtain a green card in 12 months, while those from another—even a person who happens to have superior training and skills—will be unable to obtain a green card for possibly decades, it is virtually unavoidable that the employer will take national origin into account. Think about that. One section of the U.S. Code forbids employers from taking national origin into account when making employment decisions; another section makes it impossible for an employer not to take that into account. The grounds on which that kind of system can be defended as sound public policy are beyond me.

The pernicious consequences of this intrinsically flawed system do not stop there, as 95 percent of immigrants stuck in the green card backlog are already in the United States on temporary visas. In many cases, they have brought their spouses and their children with them to build a life in this country. Yet, because temporary visa holders can only sponsor their foreign-born child up until the time the child turns 21, many in the backlog, waiting decades for a green card, are forced to choose between separating from their child as the child ages out of the temporary visa or abandoning their dream of settling in America in order to return to their home country in order to keep their family together. In the most heartbreaking among those cases—of

which there are sadly far too many—the child was brought here at a very young age and may have no memory of the country to which they would be forced to return.

It bears repeating. This is happening not because these individuals broke the law—they haven't done anything wrong—and it is not because they don't satisfy the merit-based eligibility criteria needed to receive an employment-based green card. I understand that immigration laws do have consequences, and we have to follow the law, but it doesn't stem from any violation of the law or any lack of eligibility stemming from any factor other than country of origin. It happens for no reason other than the country in which they happen to have been born.

If that made sense, if there were some sound principle and public policy that anyone could point to, then perhaps we wouldn't have occasion to be talking about changing this law. Perhaps we wouldn't have gotten 365 votes, Democrats and Republicans joining together in the House of Representatives voting to pass this. The fact is, I have yet to meet anyone in this body or in the House of Representatives who can defend this flawed policy on its merits because it makes no sense.

Finally, the per-country cap system is irredeemably flawed because, among its other problems, it is also incompatible with the goals that our employment-based visa system are meant to advance in the first place. The employment-based visa system is supposed to enable American businesses to bring the best and the brightest to this country. Yet, under the per-country caps, a factor that has nothing to do with a person's skills or merit distorts and in many cases ultimately determines the recruitment process. This weakens the merit-based portion of our immigration system. Indeed, it is directly at war with the supposed purpose of our employment-based green card system.

Despite its obvious deficiencies, the per-country caps have been part of our immigration laws since the 1950s. This is something that came into our law during the Elvis Presley era, during the Buddy Holly era—not exactly something that was intended to remain on the books very long. Regardless of what they intended at the time as far as how long it should last, I don't believe they had good, legitimate reasons to put it into law then. Whatever reasons they had then certainly don't apply now. They are not even discernible to anyone I know today.

It is long past time that we replace that flawed policy with a more rational and equitable approach. Fortunately, the solution to these problems is not only straightforward, but it is agreed upon by a broad bipartisan coalition of Senators and Representatives. We must simply eliminate the per-country caps in order to ensure a fair and reasonable allocation of employment-based green cards. That is exactly what the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act

would accomplish. Without the per-country caps, our skills-based green card system would operate on a first come, first served basis, ensuring that immigrants would be admitted into the United States based purely on their merit rather than their country of origin.

This reform would also ensure that the hardships caused by decades-long wait times are eliminated. As I have said in the past, there is no question that immigration is one of if not the most politically fraught issues in Congress right now. It makes it all the more important for us, at least, to come together to get something done in the areas where we can find common ground. The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is an important point of common ground.

Any immigration bill that has 35 Senate cosponsors—20 Republicans and 15 Democrats, as this bill does—presents a unique opportunity to secure a victory for the American people. The reason this bill commands such widespread support from all points along the political spectrum is because, as I have explained, the arguments in its favor are not your typical partisan or ideological arguments. No. They are commonsense arguments about the way any rational legal system should work in that it makes clear that the per-country caps system must go.

That is what is needed to make our immigration laws consistent with our principles, consistent with other laws on the books, and consistent with the merit-based objectives this component of our immigration system is meant to promote.

The other reason the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act has been so successful in attracting support from both sides of the aisle is because we have scrupulously avoided the typical poison pills that so often doom many good-faith attempts at immigration reform. This bill is not comprehensive in its approach. It is not a comprehensive immigration reform package. It is not even close to that. That is, in fact, why this bill is something we can actually get done now. That is why this bill is so close to being passed. It is why this bill really should pass into law today.

While it does not fix many of the other flaws that plague our broken immigration system, it is a great and a vitally important start to reform. If we are ever to have a chance at modernizing and repairing our immigration laws, we need to recognize that we cannot necessarily solve all of our problems at once. The fact that this is the case shouldn't stand in the way of us starting to work on the issues the American people sent us here to solve. We cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the excellent. That is why I have come to seek unanimous consent to pass this legislation today.

Look, I understand it has drawn an objection, but it has drawn an objection in a way that drew an objection a

few weeks ago from another Member. We have been able to work through that Member's concerns. I am hopeful, I am optimistic that my colleague who raised an objection today can be persuaded that this bill needs to be passed, we can address his concerns, and that we can resolve them.

I will be working with my distinguished friend and colleague from Georgia throughout this weekend to try to find a solution, some explanation, or, if necessary, language that can win his support. We are very close on what we believe is appropriate and acceptable.

I remain steadfastly convinced that this law, as written, as amended, as offered up by unanimous consent today could and should be the law of the land. I believe it is ready for prime time. It is ready to become law, but when seeking unanimity on a measure in order to pass it, one must do everything one can do in order to seek actual unanimity, and that is what I intend to do in the coming days. I intend to be back next week, making yet another attempt to pass this bill into law, and I hope and expect we will be able to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator for Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, thank you. I appreciate your comment, "The Senator for Alabama." That is exactly how I like to be recognized, so thank you very much.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2486

Mr. President, I rise today to appeal to my colleagues to support the renewal of vital funding for historically Black colleges and universities and all minority-serving institutions.

I have risen in this body on more than one occasion to talk about the importance of HBCUs and minority-serving institutions.

Alabama is home to 14 HBCUs—more than any other State in the country. They are part of the fabric of our economy in Alabama and a part of the fabric of our society. They are the pride of their communities. They are the pride of those folks who went there and had relatives who went there and even those individuals who are not alums or relatives of alums.

Our HBCUs are a source of enduring pride in our State and across this country. They serve an incredibly important function. They educate those from underserved communities more than any other college or university. It is important that we continue funding them because their challenges with funding are great.

They do not have the endowments that other colleges and universities have. They don't have the source of funding. It is only through our efforts in Congress and across the country that we can continue the great work of these HBCUs.

Recently, the House passed what is known as the FUTURE Act, which is H.R. 2486. My colleague Senator SCOTT and I have a similar bill that has been introduced in the Senate because, at

the end of September, all funding for HBCUs is set to end.

Our act would extend that. We need to make sure that we fund all of our HBCUs, that they are not left in the lurch and not left with any uncertainty about their future funding. I truly believe this is such a bipartisan effort that we can get this across the finish line. I have urged Senator McConnell to put this on the floor because it is quite urgent.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2486, which is at the desk; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator for Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object.

The Senator from Alabama is a valued member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. Ensuring that historically Black colleges and universities have continued funding is something we all want to do. However, instead of the short-term patch, I favor a long-term solution.

I am ready to do this, along with a few other bipartisan higher education proposals that also have bipartisan support. Such a package could include permanent mandatory funding of \$255 million for historically Black colleges and universities and reduction of the number of questions on the FAFSA that 20 million families fill out every year for their Federal aid, as Senators BENNET and JONES have proposed. I would like to see the Senate pass again the legislation Senator MURRAY and I persuaded the Senate to pass that reduces the current FAFSA to 22 questions. Senators SCHATZ, LEE, and DURBIN have proposed Pell grants for prisoners. There is a proposal by Senators PORTMAN and KAINE and many other bipartisan Senators on short-term Pell grants for job training. We could expand Pell grant eligibility. We could increase the maximum Pell grant award.

These are all things we should be able to agree on, including funding for historically Black colleges and universities. I have been talking with Senator MURRAY now for several years about reauthorizing the Higher Education Act. I intend to discuss this all with her and with our committee members next week.

We have the time to do it because, while the legislation expires at the end of this month, the money doesn't for several more months. So, in the meantime, I hope we can work together, as we often do in our committee, to pass a smaller package of higher education proposals, including a long-term proposal for historically Black colleges and universities, while we continue to work on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, what we are seeing here today really disappoints me. We have, today, a straightforward opportunity to prevent a critical part of our higher education system—HBCUs, Tribal colleges, and other minority-serving institutions—from having to deal with a lapse in funding. We should take it. This is bipartisan legislation. It has passed the House. There is no reason at all to delay it a minute longer here in the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for his leadership on this. I express my personal strong support for the FUTURE Act, which will give us then time to work out a permanent fix for funding HBCUs, Tribal colleges, and minority-serving institutions through a comprehensive HEA reauthorization, which is what I have made clear is necessary.

I appreciate what the Senator from Tennessee said about moving forward with higher education reauthorization. I am hopeful we can continue to work on reaching a compromise, as we have done on several other pieces of legislation. As I have said before, I believe any reauthorization of the Higher Education Act needs to have real answers to the challenges students are facing today on affordability and access and accountability and campus safety. I truly believe we have an opportunity to get a comprehensive bill done that helps solve these challenges for our students.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee and our colleagues on the HELP Committee continue to focus on our efforts there. Meanwhile, I believe we should listen to the Senator from Alabama. We should pass the bipartisan FUTURE Act instead of playing politics with valuable and underresourced institutions.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED AUTO WORKERS STRIKE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, right now at this moment, thousands of UAW workers in Ohio—in places like the Chevrolet plant in Parma-Cleveland area, the transmission plant in Toledo, the plant in Defiance, OH, and all over the country—are going without their paychecks and without their health insurance to demand that General Motors respect the work they do to make their companies successful.

In a nutshell, workers are fed up. More and more of them are beginning to see that unions are the best way to make their voices heard. For too long,

General Motors hasn't listened. Auto-workers are the engine behind GM's success. GM wouldn't be making a dime in profit without the workers who actually make their cars and trucks.

Back up for a moment. Think about what has happened to General Motors. The Presiding Officer has autoworkers in the State of Indiana, as I do in Ohio. Back up 10 years, when General Motors and Chrysler went into bankruptcy. The taxpayers and workers—through givebacks—rescued both companies. For 10 years, GM has gotten more and more profitable. Workers were working hard, but workers were making significantly less money during those 10 years. Then you saw these companies' profits increase. GM started sending more jobs to Mexico to build the Chevy Blazer, for instance. The same day, they announced the layoff of one shift in Lordstown. Then there were the stock buybacks from the Trump tax cuts, where 80 percent of the tax benefits went to the richest 1 percent of people in this country. The stock buybacks with the GM executives meant tens of millions of dollars more in their pocket. Yet they continue to squeeze workers. Now workers are simply saying: We want to be, in essence, paid back for the givebacks we did when we, as taxpayers and workers, rescued that company.

Rather than invest in American workers, the company shut down its most productive plant in North America and laid off hundreds of workers—4,500 workers, actually—in Lordstown, OH, while announcing they are going to build a place in Mexico. They could retool the Lordstown plant. They could build the Blazer in Ohio, but instead they throw workers out of a job, and they pay workers way less to make cars in Mexico.

Now GM workers are saying: Enough. I stand with them. They are standing up and fighting for increased investments in their local communities. We know if that Lordstown plant would reopen with the Blazer or with an electric vehicle—a couple of electric vehicles or whatever they put there—we know what that would mean for those Lordstown families, those GM families. We know what it would mean to that community.

I spoke yesterday with Dave Green, the former President of GM Local 1112. He is now working in another GM plant in the Presiding Officer's home State. He is away from his family. He is away from home. He didn't choose that. Dozens of workers are in that situation all because GM wanted to move its production offshore. Those workers are saying: Enough.

In Lordstown, the workers whose jobs GM took are picketing in solidarity with other UAW workers at the empty plant. Reporters asked them why, and they answered: Brotherhood—brother and sister support. Workers who transfer to other plants in Michigan, Missouri, Kentucky, and Indiana are coming back to join them. That is what the

labor movement is all about: brotherhood, sisterhood, solidarity. It is about the recognition that workers should have a voice and should have a share in the profits they create for their companies. GM made more than \$10 billion in North America in 2018. That is \$10,000 million. It is the UAW workers who made that money for the company. What did GM do? They shut down plants.

Now they have thrown striking workers off their health insurance. We heard from one worker in Local 14 in Toledo who said his 4-year-old daughter, Chesney, had a doctor's appointment scheduled next week to check on the tubes in her ears that help her hear, but GM canceled that family's insurance so they had to cancel the appointment. That is what has happened. It is despicable.

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

Again, 10 years ago, taxpayers rescued GM out of bankruptcy. Workers agreed to major givebacks to that company, taking much less money in order to save the company. GM profits have soared. GM executive compensations have exploded upward. GM owes that to our communities, and GM owes that to its workers.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO ALAINA VIK

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is that time of the week—the end of the week in the Senate—when I come to the floor and recognize someone special in the great State of Alaska, someone who is doing something important for their community, for the State, for the country. It is the highlight of my week, and I know it is for our pages.

We have some new pages here. It is commonly recognized as the favorite speech of the week for the pages because they get to hear stories about real people, particularly people in Alaska.

You will hear a lot of these speeches as you are here working hard in the Senate.

We are glad the new pages are here.

As you know, my State is certainly one of the most interesting, imagined States in the whole country. By the way, people watching in the Gallery—my friend Scott Lee is up there—watching on TV, come up to Alaska. You will love it. I guarantee you, it will be the trip of a lifetime. No one comes to Alaska and is disappointed.

I like to talk about Alaska on the Senate floor. People see a lot of what is

going on in the State on the nature channels and the adventure channels. There is a story about Alaska on cable TV, it seems like, daily, almost hourly. Not nearly enough of these stories focus on the people who live there— independent, patriotic, generous men, women, and, yes, kids, children, who call Alaska home.

Today, I want to recognize 13-year-old Alaina Vik, who lives in Eagle River, AK. That is a beautiful community, about 15 miles north of Anchorage.

Alaina is a young woman with a big heart. She lives with her mother, Amy, who owns her own real estate company, and her father, Curtis, who is an Alaska State trooper. He is someone I know well because he and I served together with the very outstanding Marine Corps Reserve unit based in Alaska, Echo Company, 4th Recon Battalion.

Trooper Vik, semper fi.

To you and Amy, great job on raising such an exceptional daughter.

Why is she so exceptional? Let's get into what Alaina has done for us. But, first, let me talk a little bit about what is going on in Alaska because I always like to update what is happening in this speech.

I was home for the whole month of August—actually, almost 5 weeks. I did a week of my own on Marine Corps Reserve duty. It was great to be home. I got to travel all over the State. When I say “travel all over,” we are talking hundreds, if not thousands, of miles, literally, between communities. There was a lot going on.

Unfortunately, as it happens in so many summers in Alaska, fires were taking their toll, but the weather was amazing, with beautiful blue skies. For the most part, the sun was out. It was perfect for fishing, hiking, and camping—all the things that so many people in Alaska who come to visit and live here do in the summer.

Now we are heading into the fall. Leaves are starting to turn. It is moose hunting season. The snow isn't far away for most of the State. In some parts of the State, it is actually already on the ground.

Some might say that winter is coming, but I think it is too soon. Winter is coming, but not just yet. I will let you know when that happens.

School has started, and Alaina Vik has entered eighth grade. Her favorite subject is art. Like so many Alaskans, she has been busy. What has she been busy doing? Why are we honoring this young Alaskan who is doing a lot for our State?

First, as a Girl Scout in Troop 690, under the amazing leadership of the troop leader, Mrs. Melissa Jones, Alaina sold more cookies than any other Girl Scout in the entire State of Alaska—more than 5,000 boxes. That is amazing; isn't it?

I love Girl Scout cookies. I think they are the best in the country, but 5,000 boxes in one State is pretty darn impressive.

What is her secret? She said: “My mom told me to go out almost every day to sell cookies, to talk to people and to interest them in buying the cookies.”

Her older brother, Kyle, who, by the way, is an Eagle Scout—you could see what a high-achieving family this is—also helped coach his sister and helped take her out to sell cookies.

Alaina said: “I'm a really hard worker when it comes to Girl Scout cookies.” Obviously, she is—5,000 boxes.

Selling cookies just wasn't good enough for her. She wanted to do more for her Girl Scout project. So she took her passion to the next level, using her selling skills to help others and focusing on the men and women in our military, particularly those who are deployed.

In Alaska, we proudly boast of having the record of more vets per capita than any State in the country. So this is something that a lot of our communities can get behind. She and her fellow Girl Scouts began to send our deployed military members Girl Scout cookies. She got the idea when the father of one of the members of her Girl Scout troop was deployed. Her troop wanted to make sure he felt remembered on his deployment.

All told, in 2017, she was able to donate 800 boxes to our troops, some of whom are deployed in Kuwait and Qatar.

She didn't stop there. As I have often said, we live in one of the most patriotic States in the country. Alaina Vik is just one more bit of proof of that. She wanted to do more for the men and women in uniform. She said:

They're fighting for us. They're protecting us. They deserved to be appreciated [and remembered] and honored.

This is a 13-year-old girl. Remember, she is also the daughter of a recon marine.

With the help of her mother, Amy, and her father, Curtis, and her two younger brothers, she expanded her effort into what is now called Operation Sweet Support. You could find that on Facebook. In addition to just cookies, she is also sending snacks, pencils, duct tape, and toys. Who doesn't need a toy or duct tape when they are deployed? You can use it for everything.

When the news got out about this project, she started to receive donations from all over the community in Eagle River and all over Alaska. So far this year, through this project, she has sent out over 98 care packages to Alaskan troops who are deployed overseas, particularly in Kosovo and Kuwait. She is aiming to send out 75 more by the end of the year—one 13-year-old girl in the great State of Alaska.

She puts a personalized handwritten note into each of the boxes thanking them. “This is my way of saying thank you,” one of her notes reads.

Here is another one:

You are amazing and appreciated and loved. Thank you for your service.

That is another note from Alaina to our service men and women deployed overseas.

She gets notes back, of course. One wrote:

Thank you for everything you've done for us. Please keep supporting the troops [and sending cookies].

Our military members love cookies. They say it makes a big difference.

Someone also sent her an American flag that was flown overseas in appreciation of the cookies, as well as a unit coin, a military coin, sent to Alaina by our appreciative troops. "It was amazing," she said, when she got this.

As someone who has been deployed myself, away from family and friends, I know what it means to get such care packages. It means the world. It means that people back home are remembering what you are doing.

Alaina, thank you for your great work supporting our troops, for the example you are setting for all the young men and women, not just in Alaska but America.

Amy and Curtis, thanks for raising such a wonderful daughter.

Alaina, keep up the great work. Congratulations, once again, on being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

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

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

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution that would recognize September as National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. In the United States, more than 15,000 kids are diagnosed with cancer every single year, and more than 300,000 children are diagnosed globally.

On average, more than 75 children in West Virginia alone are diagnosed with cancer every year, which has been a steady increase over the last 10 years. We have made a lot of progress over the last few decades in research for prevention and care, but there is more work to be done. That is why I am here today to continue the drumbeat and elevate the issue.

I will share a story of a young man I met just last week. On Friday, I had the honor of visiting with students and teachers at George Washington High School in Charleston, WV. One student by the name of Nicholas "Nick" Spence came up to me during my visit and shared that at age 15 he was diagnosed with cancer. He later sent me a letter telling me about his story and asked me to help raise awareness of childhood cancer, which I assumed we had already done since we have done it for adult cancer.

Nick's letter goes like this:

Dear Senator Manchin,

Thank you for visiting my school on Friday. It was really cool to meet you. As I shared with you in person, at age 15 my life was changed forever. Before then, it never crossed my mind that I would become a cancer patient, much less a pediatric one.

I was diagnosed with cancer and underwent chemotherapy. As a result, in May 2018, I had to have my leg amputated.

After two long years, I am proud to say that I finally overcame and defeated my cancer, and I'm currently a senior at George Washington High School.

I feel very strongly that there needs to be more awareness about childhood cancer in West Virginia, and I appreciated speaking with you about that during your visit.

That's why I'm writing today to ask you to continue fighting for West Virginians and to do whatever you can to help raise awareness about childhood cancer.

Signed, Nick Spence

Thank you, Nick, for standing up and reaching out to me. I will never forget how you walked across the gym after we were done with the meeting with all of the students at your high school, and I was impressed by your willingness to stand up and come over and tell me, basically, what you were concerned about and what you want to change.

In addition, I would also like to recognize some very special guests who have driven here today from West Virginia, and they are in the Senate Chamber today. From Charleston, WV, we have Kelly Wymer, Ali Wymer, and Cherie White. I thank them for attending and being here. They are in town representing the West Virginia Kids Cancer Crusaders at the CureFest here in DC on the National Mall.

When Ali was just 6½ years old, she was diagnosed with cancer. She underwent 2½ years of treatment, including two surgeries and chemotherapy.

We are so proud to have Ali here in the Chamber with us today. She is currently 21 years old and healthy as can be. They said "healthy as a horse." I say "healthy as can be." She is a student at BridgeValley Community and Technical College, majoring in healthcare—what else?

Nick, I know you are at home watching this now, and I just want to thank you. I really want to thank you for sharing your story with me. It really touched me how brave you are for speaking up and advocating for people other than yourself.

I am glad we were able to do this in such quick order. Usually things don't happen this quickly in Washington, but, truly, when it comes to the children of our country and our home State, it means so much to us.

I am proud to say that this is a bipartisan resolution, and I have teamed up with Senator JOSH HAWLEY from Missouri to introduce this resolution. This resolution is also supported by Senator JACK REED from Rhode Island and my fellow West Virginia Senator, SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO.

In addition to recognizing September as National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month, this resolution calls on

Federal, State, and local governments, along with nonprofit organizations, to create and host programs and activities that focus on increasing public knowledge on the risks of cancer.

Finally, this resolution recognizes the human toll of cancer and makes a pledge that the United States of America will make the prevention and cure of cancer a public health priority.

I am proud to introduce this resolution. And, Nick, thank you again. Ali, thank you, and thanks to all of those who are so brave and the families who support them and help raise awareness for childhood cancer.

I urge all of my colleagues—all of my colleagues—to join me in supporting this resolution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO BERNARD INGOLD

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mr. REED, as the chair and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, as well as the cochairs of the Senate Army Caucus, it is our honor to pay tribute to a great leader, an exceptional officer, and a senior executive of the U.S. Army, Mr. Bernard P. Ingold. Mr. Ingold is the principle deputy chief of legislative liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, and as he prepares to leave this position for a well-deserved retirement, we commend him for his outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to the Army, Congress, and this Nation.

Bernie Ingold has served our Army and our Nation for more than 40 years as an Army officer and a Department of the Army civilian. A native of Michigan, Mr. Ingold was commissioned in 1979 as a judge advocate general officer upon earning a degree in law from the University of Arkansas. His service to the Nation included roles as a deputy staff judge advocate for U.S. Army Berlin, as a legislative counsel for the office of the chief of