

rights, on their rights to harvest wild rice, but you are saying: I am not going to come down on that side of the scale.

What you are going to do if you support H.J. Res. 140 is you are going to come down—who is the winner here? You are going to come down on the side of a Chilean billionaire, a Chilean billionaire who owns the largest copper mine—the largest copper company—in the whole world, a Chilean billionaire who is going to take our minerals, ship them to the Pacific coast, where they are going to go to China to get smelted—where this company has a sweetheart deal with their smelters. Then, if we are lucky, that copper is going to be sold back to us at a profit.

That is not an “America First” strategy, colleagues. That is a “Chilean Billionaire First” strategy.

I can't help but just recognize that, as we are on the cusp of making this decision in the Senate, isn't it ironic that President Trump, who says that he is a supporter of miners and that he stands with steelworkers, is about to use foreign steel to build his billionaire ballroom off of the White House? What is that about?

Now, look, I understand that there are different perspectives on this mining issue—I see this play out every single day in my beloved State of Minnesota—but as you vote, I ask you to think about this: I ask you to think about the precedent that you are setting here because here is what I have learned after having been in the Senate for the last 9 years: What goes around comes around. What goes around comes around because what you would be doing here, colleagues, is you would be allowing this public land order to be rescinded under the Congressional Review Act. This is a dangerous precedent. This has never been done before. Public land orders have never previously been submitted by any administration, including the Trump administration, as rules subject to the CRA. This would be the first one submitted even though this public land order was submitted 3 years ago, processed legally, and done by the book—done by the book that Congress wrote.

So what does this really mean if this is the step that the Senate takes today?

What this would mean is that any public land order that has been done over, potentially, decades could then be rescinded by some partisan act of Congress just willy-nilly. Think about what this means. It means mineral leases, and it means timber public land orders in North Dakota. It means that any public land order that has been out there in the past or potentially any administrative action could be just undone under a privileged process in the U.S. Senate.

Colleagues, I beseech you not to do this. I know that this is a terrible thing for us to do. I know that not only will it have impacts for my beloved Boundary Waters in my State but that it will have impacts in all of our States.

So, as I close, I want to speak directly to the Minnesota people who care so much about the Boundary Waters and who care so much about the precious places that we have all over this country.

You have organized. You have made calls. You have sent messages. I am thinking about the hunting and fishing groups. I am thinking about the outdoor groups. I am thinking about the Minnesota citizens and American citizens. I am thinking about all of the Tribal leaders and members who have made your voices heard.

I want everyone to know that whatever the outcome of this vote this afternoon, that we will not stop fighting, and we will not stop our work to protect the Boundary Waters. Of all the places that we have in this country, this place has such special meaning. It is a sacred place, and we will never stop defending it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

#### VOTE ON H.J. RES. 140

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

#### YEAS—50

Armstrong	Fischer	Moran
Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McCormell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	

#### NAYS—49

Alsobrooks	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Hassan	Ossoff
Bennet	Heinrich	Padilla
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Rosen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Collins	Kim	Schatz
Cooms	King	Schiff
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Schumer
Duckworth	Lujan	Shaheen
Durbin	Markey	Slotkin
Fetterman	Merkley	Smith
Gallego	Murphy	Tillis

Van Hollen	Warren	Wyden
Warner	Welch	
Warnock	Whitehouse	
NOT VOTING—1		
Hawley		

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 140) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to H.J. Res. 140, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Andrew B. Davis, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 4317 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### FISA

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, soon, we will cast important votes here in the Senate on surveillance law. I rise today to share some important new developments about the surveillance practices of this administration, which are vital to this debate.

Today, I want to start by warning my colleagues: Any Senator who votes to reauthorize this law without real reform will be directly responsible when the Trump team abuses their spying powers to go after Americans. I want the Senate to know the alarm bells are loud and getting louder.

Senators know the surveillance law known as section 702 of FISA expires on Monday. I have been on the Intelligence Committee since the law was written. It is undeniably a useful tool that American intelligence agencies rely on to collect information about foreigners outside the country. The problem is that 702 lacks adequate safeguards to protect Americans whose emails and texts or other communications can get swept up in this surveillance. So you could have Americans doing legitimate, often sensitive, important work—journalists, foreign aid workers, people with family overseas, even women seeking abortion medication from a provider overseas.

Reformers argue that 702 should only be reauthorized with stronger protections—protections for constitutional