

getting a pay raise to our people in the military.

We should not have been here in the first place. We had a joint select committee last year, and we have been working on this for 5 years. It is time to fix this budget process once and for all. We have to hold Congress accountable, though. In most States, we don't have this problem. In 44 States, No. 1, you have a balanced budget law, but more importantly than that, in States like Georgia, if the legislature doesn't fund the government by the end of the legislative session, by law, the legislators don't go home.

Senator LANKFORD and I and others have bills that would require the same thing here. As a matter of fact, some of us have actually put in bills that would stop the pay for staff and employees and would stop Members' compensation until we get this done. A requirement of our job here is to get the government funded.

It is very simple. It is time for Congress to do its job. I am chagrined that we face another continuing resolution that we have educated people about and will cost hundreds of billions of dollars over a decade because of the damage it will do to the supply chain when we are trying to get readiness and recapitalization back in our U.S. military and talk about rationalization. It keeps us from doing each of those three things right now.

Anybody in the military who is before us in committee tells us over and over and over of the damaging effects a continuing resolution has on our military at the very time when we are trying to stand up to peer pressures in a unique, new way. We have five threats across five domains. We have never faced that before. Yet here we are, hamstringing our military once again.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, last weekend, the world watched as an attack was launched on the oil processing infrastructure of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The attack initially reduced Saudi Arabia's daily output capability by half, and that represents about 5 percent of the daily global production. Oil prices around the globe spiked by as much as 19 percent before starting to fall on the news that there was enough oil in reserves around the world to deal with any short-term reduction from Saudi Arabia. One of those reserve nations they were talking about, of course, included this great Nation, the United States.

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve is important to maintain. I think we all

recognize that, especially in light of the attack on Saudi Arabia. Yet I have always believed and had the mindset that we need long-term energy supply solutions in this country. As the attack on Saudi Arabia has displayed, there is no foreign substitute for American energy.

Should this attack on Saudi Arabia have happened before our Nation's energy renaissance, we would have been in a much worse situation. The near monopolistic control other nations once had on the oil and gas market no longer exist—a credit to American ingenuity and innovation. Over the last decade, we have had a turning point in this country on energy, which is something that leaders around the world talk to and point to in the United States. We have produced more oil and gas, we have improved energy conservation, and we have diversified our energy sources.

In 2015, we got rid of another handcuff to securing energy independence. We lifted the export ban on oil. That policy change both boosted America's domestic energy industry and is helping today to settle markets after the attack in Saudi Arabia. Lifting the ban has unleashed millions of barrels of oil into the marketplace, which has kept prices steady and reduced the influence of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, or OPEC, and Russia. Think about that, what the United States has done to reduce that influence.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, U.S. petroleum and natural gas production increased by 16 percent and 12 percent respectively in 2018. These totals combined established a new production record. The United States surpassed Russia in 2011 to become the world's largest producer of natural gas and surpassed Saudi Arabia in 2018 to become the world's largest producer of petroleum. Last year's increase in the United States was also one of the largest absolute petroleum and natural gas production increases in history from a single country.

The United States continues this trend toward energy independence, and that is a good thing. Yet, despite these successes, there are those who want to not just stop this trend but who fully intend to reverse our energy independence. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have endorsed a Federal fracking ban. They want to ban the very production that gave us energy independence, that gave us independence from OPEC and Russia. They have endorsed ending fossil fuel exports, and they have endorsed eliminating energy development on Federal land. Yet, tell me, do any of these policies actually result in more affordable energy prices? Do these policies make energy more reliable? Do these policies keep the price at the pump down? Do these policies keep our allies across the globe safer? Do these policies keep our troops safer?

Let's take gas prices. If my Democratic colleagues were truly concerned about the impact of gas prices on their constituents' pocketbooks, I am curious if any of them would come up with a calculation of what gas prices would be after the ban of hydraulic fracturing, the stopping of exporting fossil fuels to the global market, and the stopping of energy development on Federal land. What would the price be? I guarantee you that there wouldn't be very much opportunity or at least very much comfort for their constituents.

Over 20 percent of the crude oil produced in this country in 2018 came from Federal land. There is little doubt that eliminating 20 percent of the supply of oil would have a significant impact on gas prices. Yet that is exactly what several have called for. Fracking has extended the productive life and resource recovery at the Bakken, Eagle Ford Shale, Marcellus Shale, Niobrara, and Permian Basin formations, just to name a few.

As a matter of fact, the U.S. Geological Survey published an updated assessment of the Permian Basin's resources in 2018. By itself, the Permian already produces one-third of the Nation's oil, and the updated assessment estimates that over 46 billion barrels of oil, 280 trillion cubic feet of gas, and 20 billion barrels of natural gas liquids are trapped in these low-permeability shale formations. The Nation's supply of oil and gas reserves essentially doubled in the blink of an eye, according to that report.

Colorado's Western Slope is home to the Piceance Basin. In 2016, the USGS issued a similarly larger reassessment of the recoverable resources in the Piceance. The USGS estimated mean volumes of 66.3 trillion cubic feet of gas, 74 million barrels of oil, and 45 million barrels of natural gas liquids.

The Uinta-Piceance Basin that covers western Colorado and eastern Utah has an abundant supply of natural gas that could be exported through a west coast liquefied natural gas terminal, like Jordan Cove, to our allies in the Pacific.

We have enough energy resources to meet our domestic needs and to meet the needs of energy overseas. So let's relish that fact. Rarely do we have a chance to provide economic opportunities here at home, to provide energy security to our partners abroad and make sure our allies have those opportunities as well, and to use the innovation and the investments we have made here to weaken our enemies all in one area, like in energy production.

Let's think about what the world would look like if we had not moved in the direction of increased domestic production in recent years.

The decline of Venezuela's oil production over the last 12 years and the resulting political instability in the country would have hurt the import ability of the United States. OPEC and Russia would have a significantly larger role than they do today in determining the global production levels,

and we have seen how that has played out for the United States in the past. We could very well be where China is today—overly dependent on imports from Saudi Arabia and terrified at the slightest hiccup in its production ability, which could have far-reaching consequences for our economy or, rather, we would find ourselves exactly where we were in 1973.

That is where we will end up if my colleagues get their way and ban energy production, hydraulic fracturing, or pass the Green New Deal, as they would like. These policies would make us once again dependent on foreign sources of energy and make us vulnerable to the geopolitical manipulation that comes with that dependence.

As recently as 2005, we were dependent on imports for two-thirds of our oil consumption—more than twice what we were reliant on in 1973 when we had a supply crisis during the embargo. If that were still true today, this attack on Saudi Arabia would be a significant cause of concern for the United States and for the U.S. oil supply. Yet, because of the pursuit of energy independence in the United States and the security we have achieved through these innovations and developments, we are confident that we can weather short-term supply disruptions in the global market.

Banning production, banning the development of energy in Colorado, or implementing policies like the Green New Deal would kill not only our opportunity to be energy independent and weather the storm of a global supply crisis, but it would also kill millions of jobs around the United States that pay far above average wages. The oil and gas industry supports over 10 million jobs in the United States, and it accounts for almost 8 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States. The jobs have an average salary of over \$100,000 a year. These are good-paying jobs that enable people to provide for their families, contribute to domestic energy security and our goal of energy independence, and they will allow us the ability to send a responsibly developed resource to our allies overseas who want a dependable trade partner.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, though, simply want to do away with this industry, those jobs, those salaries, that freedom, the independence, and the prosperity that it brings.

Instead of talking about putting our traditional energy sources out of business, why don't we talk about hardening our energy infrastructure, protecting these critical assets, and continuing to responsibly produce those resources for us, the environment, and for the world? Doing so is a win for the United States. It is also a win for our communities and those who wish to partner with us in order to fuel the world's economy.

It is incredibly important that we have energy independence, and I can't think of a more disruptive crisis the

world could have faced had this happened in a country in which we no longer had the production that we do today. I hope we can work together on energy policies that continue to create jobs and grow the American economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Colorado.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. CON. RES. 10

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, several months ago, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had the opportunity to sit down with the Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, to talk about a number of concerns around the globe, including our concerns about Huawei and ZTE and the fact that Huawei and ZTE pose serious threats to the national security of the United States and its allies.

At the time, there had been a lot of discussion about what was happening in Europe and other places around the globe and about whether Huawei would be allowed to participate in our allies' networks and what that could mean for U.S. national security and our ability to continue to engage in national security conversations, intelligence operations, sharing of information, and the like.

In that conversation, Secretary Pompeo said—and this was the entire group of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both Republican and Democratic Members—in that conversation, Secretary Pompeo said that what would help would be to let Congress's voice be heard when it comes to Huawei and ZTE and that we should send a strong message to our allies that our concern with Huawei and ZTE is not a Republican issue, it is not a Democratic issue, it is not just a one-term-of-Congress concern, but it is an ongoing concern that we have with the security of our systems, our information, the lack of security and the vulnerability that Huawei and ZTE networks and equipment pose to the United States; that we send a message to our allies in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion that if they go forward and allow Huawei or ZTE to have access to their critical infrastructure networks, then that is going to pose problems for the United States; that we may have to tell them: Look, this kind of action could have consequences; that perhaps we don't share as much information with them as we otherwise would, or it could mean that certain facilities we were going to build together won't be built but all because of our concern over Huawei and ZTE.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senators COONS, MARKEY, CRUZ, and RUBIO, who have joined me in cosponsoring this resolution.

I want to thank Chairman RISCH and Ranking Member CARDIN for working with my office to get this resolution condemning and making a very strong statement against the actions of Huawei and ZTE back in July.

Again, Huawei and ZTE pose a serious threat to the United States and our

allies around the globe. This resolution makes clear many of the longstanding and bipartisan efforts we have made together to warn about the threats these companies pose to our critical telecommunications infrastructure. It further makes clear that the United States should reiterate to countries choosing to incorporate Huawei or ZTE into their new telecommunications infrastructure that the United States will seek to limit the risks posed to our government and military from use of such compromised networks.

This is an issue that shouldn't be bound by partisanship; it ought to cut across the Members of this Chamber who agree on condemning the actions of Huawei and ZTE and standing up for our national security. That is why I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 136, S. Con. Res. 10. I further ask that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the Gardner amendment at the desk to the preamble be considered and agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, Huawei presents a very real threat to the security of every American, both individually and collectively. I have long been concerned that the Trump administration was going to let Huawei off the hook in order to get a politically useful trade deal. As the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over trade matters, that concerns me greatly. In addition, I am concerned that the resolution being offered does not go far enough to protect America's national security and hold the Trump administration accountable.

Tomorrow there will be another bipartisan measure offered that, in my view, will better address the concerns I have just mentioned, and therefore I must object this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, tomorrow I plan to vote for the motion to instruct, which is in regard to language within the Defense Authorization Act that talks about the importance of protecting our national security interests against Huawei and ZTE. But when we are objecting to resolutions that are bipartisan because of motions to instruct that have no binding nature, I am concerned that perhaps we are not doing enough work to